A NEW THEOLOGY OF MINISTRY: THE ORDAINED METHODIST MINISTRY IN NEW ZEALAND 1880-1980

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the Degree

of

Master of Arts in History

in the

University of Canterbury

by

Susan J. Thompson

University of Canterbury

1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Between 1880 and 1980 the ordained ministry of the Methodist Church of New Zealand faced many changes. This study seeks to examine the way in which, during this period, the ministry lost much of its homogeneity to become instead a more diverse body, made up of and valuing a greater range of people with new and varied gifts, and prepared to explore and experiment with alternative ways of offering ministry. In doing so the thesis will concentrate on the ministry of the Wesleyans and, later, the united Methodist Church, although indicating in a general way some of the thinking and practices of the other Methodist traditions in New Zealand. The special position of the Maori ministry will be discussed in further chapters, but for the most part this study will focus on the Church's European ministry.

In tracing the development of this change to the ordained ministry, two major themes have emerged, both of which have challenged traditional assumptions about the nature of such a ministry. The first has been the desire for rigid concepts of ministry and a narrowly defined presbyterate to be opened up and made more inclusive and more flexible. As the Church has re-examined its understanding of ministry, then, it has developed a whole new theology of ministry and laity. The second has been an increasing trend towards "professionalisation and

specialisation" within ordained ministry.[1] This is expressed in the desire that the Church and the presbyterate do things in a 'professional' way, seeking 'professional' competence.

These themes run throughout the chapters to follow. This study is divided into five chapters, each examining some aspect of the changing nature of the Methodist presbyterate between 1880 and 1980. The first will look at how the ordained related to their lay colleagues in ministry, and the way in which this gradually changed as the Church accepted a more equal view of ministry. The second will trace the growth in alternative forms of ordained ministry, reflecting the Church's new willingness to experiment with different ways of working. The third will show how restrictions upon those who could enter the presbyterate were removed, allowing women, married men and Maori to be admitted to ordained ministry with full status. The fourth will trace the changing history of the process by which the Church selected its candidates for ministry - a history revealing, among other things, the desire for a more professional expertise. Finally, the fifth will show how Methodist education for ministry has developed over the century, gradually becoming more individually flexible within the College and without.

---

1 Peter J. Lineham, New Zealanders and the Methodist Evangel, An Interpretation of the Policies and Performance of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, No.42, September 1983), p.30.

The research for this work is mainly based on written, Methodist sources. The most useful of these have been the minutes of the Methodist Annual Conference. These contain the annual reports of the Church's committees, departments and institutions, and the resolutions passed by the Conference. Certain statistical material may also be derived from various lists (like, for example, the stationing list) and from the questions of Conference. This material is sometimes problematical as the Church has often displayed a lack of consistency in the way these have been kept (by, for example, changing categories and including people in more than one list). Specific problems are noted with the appropriate tables. The Church's law books have proved to be another useful source. Produced more irregularly (in thirteen editions between 1880 and 1980), these contain the rules and regulations of the Church. A less official source than these is the Journal of Conference, which records the daily business of the Conference, and so reveals something of the process leading up to the final resolutions found in the minutes. It includes the unacceptable motions and reports that are not recorded in the minutes, and some of the debate - with the names of those included - surrounding an issue. The Church's newspaper, the New Zealand Methodist Times, also contains more detailed reports on aspects of the Conference, together with all sorts of articles and letters to do with Church life.

These sources were supplemented by three interviews with Methodist ministers of different vintages now living in Christchurch; and by numerous informal conversations with friends and others involved in the Church. Thanks for sharing your thoughts and memories. I'd also like to acknowledge all the help I was given by the staff of the Methodist Archives in Christchurch (Marcia, Frank and Olive). Thanks too to my supervisor, Dr. John Cookson, and to Dr. Allan Davidson for keeping a friendly eye on my endeavours. Also boundless debts of gratitude to Dave and Denise who have got me through this last week!

CHAPTER 1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAY AND ORDAINED MINISTRY

This chapter will examine the relationship between the Methodist Church's ordained ministry and its other, lay orders, to see how this reveals changes in the Church's concepts of ministry. In doing so it will be split into three developing parts. The first will begin by looking at the way the relationship between lay and ordained was first worked out within Methodism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and the subsequent divisions this caused. The second will show how these understandings of ministry were reflected in the New Zealand Methodist Church of the early twentieth century. The third will finally go on to look at how these have gradually changed; focussing in particular on the period between the 1950s and the 1970s, which saw a somewhat hierarchical view of ministry replaced by one that was much more inclusive in intent.

When Methodism began, the differences between the ministry and the laity were essentially minimal, reflecting only a "functional differentiation between full-time and part-time workers".[1] Early Methodists had reacted against Anglican hierarchism and the "aura of holiness and special

---

1 A.D. Gilbert, Religion and Society in Industrial England, Church, Chapel and Social Change, London, Longman, 1976, p.150.

power which [priests] acquired through ordination."[2] There was no desire to set the ministry apart. Initially, Methodist preachers were not even ordained. By allowing them to preach Wesley was flouting the canons of the Church of England. But, although "firm in his attachment to the principles and practices of the English Church, and...far from...indifferent to the prerogatives of its priests",[3] Wesley still needed preachers. A large majority of bishops and priests were hostile towards his new movement, and some of the clergy who had originally joined had even defected. "Two brothers, even two so formidably tireless, could hardly methodize alone the whole of the kingdom."[4] Wesley also recognised that his preachers did have a sense of vocation, and this he was unable to deny, especially when he saw souls waiting to be saved. So he allowed them to preach.

Wesley did not begin to ordain his preachers until 1784, and then only because of the overriding need of the North American Church. He believed that he had the right to ordain - "as good a right...as to administer the Lord's supper"[5] - but his was an "essentially conservative" nature[6] and he did not want to cause a break with the Church of

---

2 Ruth Fry, Out of the Silence, Methodist Women of Aotearoa 1822-1985, Christchurch, Methodist Publishing, 1987, p.209.

3 Leslie F. Church, More About the Early Methodist People, London, The Epworth Press, 1949, p.100.

4 Stanley Ayling, John Wesley, London, William Collins Sons & Company Ltd., 1979, p.134.

5 John Wesley to Charles Wesley, June 1780, quoted by Ayling, p.285.

6 Ayling, p.288.

England. However, by 1783 there were nearly 15,000 Methodists in the American states; none of their preachers were ordained and so able to administer the sacraments. So in 1784 Wesley ordained Whatcoat and Vasey and "re-ordained" Dr. Coke as their superintendent "to go and serve the desolate sheep of America."[7] These first ordinations were followed by others for America, Scotland, and finally England in 1788.

Methodist preachers were thus ordained, but the real differentiation of ministerial and lay roles did not take place until after Wesley's death. Between 1791 and c.1840 Methodism was transformed by a tendency towards "professionalization and institutional order".[8] What had been a movement became a religious organisation. Instead of having "nothing to do but to save souls"[9] Methodists now had to face the more complex problems involved in keeping them. Expansion as the first priority inevitably gave way to consolidation. At the same time, the emergence of a full-time ministry or a 'professional pastorate' meant that there were now those for whom the clerical life offered "not simply the "religious" satisfactions of the earlier charismatic period, but also prestige and respectability, power and influence...."[10] For these men the maintenance of status would soon become important.

---

7 John Wesley's Journal, 1/9/84, quoted by Ayling, p.286.

8 Gilbert, p.151.

9 Wesley quoted in Ibid. p.149.

10 Gilbert, p.151.

The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, then, saw the differences between lay and ordained grow more pronounced within the Methodist Church. The ministerial role was no longer seen as one which a lay preacher might exercise simply by embarking upon the full-time itinerancy. Instead, moves were made to institute requirements for formal training and to define distinctive functions. The ordained were given exclusive administrative power as a Conference of Ministers within the Church. Status symbols began to be employed (the title "Reverend" after 1818 for example, and the laying-on of hands at ordination from 1836). The real incomes and social expectations of Wesleyan ministers rose rapidly during the early decades of the nineteenth century.[11]

Such moves were not, however, achieved without cost or division to the Church. The beginning of the nineteenth century was marked by a wave of revivalism which, in the south-west and north-east of England, proved unwilling to be confined to official Wesleyan channels.[12] This led to the formation of two new connexions, the Bible Christians in 1816, and the Primitive Methodists in c.1812. Opposition was also focussing on the issue of lay representation at Conference - this was to be "the grand crisis of Methodism"

---

11 Ibid.

12 E.W. Hames, Out of the Common Way, The European Church in the Colonial Era 1840-1913, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.27, Nos.3 & 4, 1972), p.19

for the next half-century and beyond.[13] Frustration with perceived ministerial absolutism resulted in more splits away from the Wesleyans. The Methodist New Connexion was established in 1797, and three separate secessions between 1827 and 1849 eventually coalesced into one single body, the United Free Methodists, in 1857. These new groups all shared a more democratic spirit and the desire to make lay representation and participation integral to their working.

Methodism came to New Zealand in these various guises. The Wesleyans were the first to arrive in 1822; they were followed by the Primitive Methodists in 1844, the United Free Methodists in 1868, and the Bible Christians in 1877. Initially each connexion operated separately, but they were eventually forced to realise that, in so small a country, they were wasting energy and resources that could be much more effectively combined. "Whatever the justification for separation in the land of their origin, there was virtually none overseas."[14] So in 1896 the Bible Christians, United Free Methodists and Wesleyans united. They were joined by the Primitive Methodists in 1913.

These different traditions brought with them their own perspectives on ministry. While it is difficult to judge the exact degree of the influence each one had on the thought and direction of the united Church, their various

---

13 John T. Wilkinson, "The Rise of Other Methodist Traditions", in Rupert Davies, A. Raymond George & Gordon Rupp (eds.), A History of The Methodist Church in Great Britain, Vol.2, London, Epworth Press, 1978, p.280.

14 Hames, Out of the Common Way, p.96.

concerns are reflected at different times and in different ways. The Wesleyan influence, though, was certainly strong in the early twentieth century. This can be seen in the way the relationship between ordained and lay reflected the autocratic outlook of both the Wesleyans in England and their founder.

The New Zealand Church has been described as "a very stable hierarchical structure", one that was dominated by its ordained ministry.[15] Church members without ordination - those in the lay orders and laypeople in general - were limited by the ordained and unable to exercise power to their degree.

At this time the New Zealand Church had two main lay orders of ministry - two orders whose members offered a lifetime of service to the Church, but who were not ordained. The home missionaries and the deaconesses both emerged in New Zealand in the late nineteenth century.

Home missionaries were originally catechists recruited to assist the early missionaries, who after 1876 began to be employed in situations where there was insufficient finance to support a minister. They were re-named home missionaries in 1890, whereafter their numbers grew sharply - from 16 in 1890 to 43 in 1910, and 57 European and 12 Maori in 1930.[16] Home missionaries met a number of the Church's most pressing needs. They provided

---

15 Ross M. Anderson, "New Zealand Methodism and World War 1: Crisis In A Liberal Church", University of Canterbury, 1983 (MA Thesis), p.39.

16 See Table 1.

temporary relief in situations where second ministers were required. They established new circuits in rural areas. They were used as an easy but very helpful means of giving practical training to potential ministers.[17]

Deaconess orders were revived in Europe early in the nineteenth century to help enable the spread of "social christianity".[18] They had emerged in New Zealand by the turn of the century, and, as shall be discussed in greater depth in a later chapter, were soon involved in a whole range of ministries.

Like the rest of the laity the lay orders were dominated by the ordained. Legislative power within the Church resided in its Annual Conference, which had been open to lay representation since 1877. It was made up of an equal number of ordained (all of those in full connexion) and lay (elected representatives from the local circuits and a few whose positions on various church boards and committees gave them ex officio membership). Theoretically, then, power was equally divided between ordained and lay. In reality, however, only a few laypeople were able to exercise any real influence, usually only those whose ex officio membership allowed them to attend for a number of years running. Essentially Conference was ruled by the ordained ministry.[19]

---

17 Lineham, p.15.

18 Fry, p.99.

19 Anderson, pp.12-18.

The ordained were, in turn, dominated by a small group of the abler and more experienced ministers. These held most of the senior posts in the Church, and moved from one such appointment to another. So they were the Presidents and Secretaries of Conference, the Connexional Secretaries and the District Chairmen. They also dominated the Stationing Committee. This was the most important committee of Conference since it controlled the placement of ministers, and it was open only to the ordained until 1916. An example of such a senior minister was William Morley, who during his career was Secretary for the Church Building and Loan Fund, twice President of Conference, and Connexional Secretary from 1893 to 1902. Once these men decided something it was extremely difficult to change. In 1902, for example, five of the six Wesleyan Synods recommended the abolition of the office of Connexional Secretary. This was opposed by Morley and, after a prolonged debate, the Synods lost a contrary recommendation by 80 votes to 6.[20]

Thus the ordained were able to maintain their dominance within the Connexion. They were a remarkably cohesive body, so splits and divisions were rare.[21] Changes to the relationship between the ordained and the lay orders would have to wait for another half-century.

The Church's ideas about the relationship between the ordained and the lay orders in the 1950's contained two

---

20 Ibid.

21 Ibid. p.17.

co-existent but potentially opposing strands of thought. One affirmed a universal ministry to which all, lay and ordained, belonged together and without regard. The other, however, maintained a hierarchy within that ministry, giving to the ordained a position of some status.

Both of these views may be found in the extensive report of 1952 from the Church's recently formed Faith and Order Committee.

The report stated that all Christians are ministers in virtue of their membership in the one Body. Both the ordained ministry and the laity "are of the esse of the Church and both share in its universal ministry". The difference between them is not to do with questions of moral or spiritual superiority - neither degree of holiness, devotion of time nor specialisation of function. Instead it is twofold. The minister is one who has received a special call from God which the Church has recognised. The minister is also one who by ordination acts as a representative of the whole Church. These differences were not linked to the status of the ordained. The Committee was, rather, concerned to declare the fundamental equality of all those within the universal ministry.[22]

Elsewhere in the report, however, the Committee had already asserted some definite inequalities within that ministry.

---

22 Methodist Annual Conference, [hereafter MAC], 1952, pp.176-180.

The post-war shortage of ministers had forced the Church into the anomalous position of having to authorise those who were not ordained (like probationers) to administer the sacraments. This was felt to be an awkward position as probationers were now performing all the ministerial functions before ordination that they would carry out after it. Thus there was a desire within the Church to regularise it. In 1949 it had been suggested that the Church adopt the solution of the American Methodists by ordaining deaconesses, home missionaries and probationers into a new order of deacons. This would give them the authorisation to administer the sacraments. It would also create for probationers a stepping-stone on the way to their ordination as ministers and reception into full connexion.[23]

For two reasons, however, this idea was not favoured by the Faith and Order Committee to which it was referred. Firstly, the Committee was against the creation of such an order of deacons. It felt that unless the Church was prepared to revise the whole structure of its ministry it would be confusing to depart from "the accepted parity of ministerial orders".[24] It also considered such a move "undesirable" in the light of the trend towards church union. This rejection of a "stepping-stone" understanding of the diaconate (the diaconate as only a step on the way to

---

23 David S. Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, An Account of Deacons and Presbyters in the Self-supporting Ministry of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, Auckland, Methodist Theological College, 1984, pp.28-9.

24 MAC, 1952, p.176.

'real' ministry) was an extremely significant decision for the future. As Mullan points out, it "left the way open for later development of a restored diaconate as a full and equal order of ministry".[25]

Secondly, the Committee did not believe that deaconesses, home missionaries or probationers should be ordained. Ordination it defined as a special act of God and the Church.

> It is the sign and seal of the Divine Commission to the Ministry of the Universal Church and marks the Church's confirmation of the ordinand's sense of Divine call and her authorisation to perform the characteristic functions of the Christian ministry.

This special act should be restricted "to the full function and status" of the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments. This ministry was "a divine gift to the Church" and "an integral part of its organic life." In comparison, the Committee called other ministries - those of the deaconesses, home missionaries, local preachers and lay administration of the sacraments - "auxiliary ministries". It conveyed no similar sense of the uniqueness of these; instead they were to be authorised "if the need arise and when [the Church was] convinced of the Divine call thereto". The inference here seems to be that the lay orders were considered only as helpers of the ordained, without a distinct or equal ministry of their own. They certainly should not be ordained. For the sake of clarity, added the Faith and Order Committee, some term such as "Commissioning"

---

25 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.39.

or "Licensing" should be used for their recognition and authorisation.[26]

Thus the Church expressed its sense of the hierarchy within ministry, in which the lay orders were thought of only as the auxiliaries of the ordained. This was reflected quite strongly in the remuneration granted its workers. The ordained were paid substantially more than the lay. In 1950, for example, ordained ministers received a standard minimum stipend of £350, home missionaries were given £300 if married or £235 if not, and deaconesses received between £210 and £225 according to their length of service.[27]

In two more major statements during the 1950s (a "Doctrine of the Ministry" in 1955, and a new Preamble to the Book of Laws in 1958) the Church continued to express its mixture of ideas about the relationship between ordained and lay.

It continued to affirm the Church's universal ministry, in which all of its members share without any question of special status. So, for example. it stated in 1954 that all Christians are "holy priests together",[28] and in 1958 that "no priesthood exists which belongs exclusively to a particular order or class of persons".[29] Ministers are set apart by ordination to be a special ministry within the

---

26 MAC, 1952, p.176.

27 Ibid. 1949, p.178.

28 Ibid. 1954, p.182.

29 Ibid. 1958, p.199.

universal ministry, but not because of any "priestly virtue inherent in the office" - it is only for the sake of church order.[30] The existence of the ordained is not to do with status but with order. They are delegated certain functions, powers and prerogatives for the sake of "order and efficiency". These are not their exclusive possession, rather they are "the inherent possession of the whole Church as the corporate Body of Christ". They may be, and often are, exercised with ability by the laity, but the divine call to the separated ministry and the specialised training given "tend to an efficiency not possible without it".[31]

The use of some rather inflated language within the statements, however, suggests that for all this there was still some desire within the Church to give to the ordained a certain prestige. For example, the fact that the ordained are "the separated and special instrument of the Church", and that they have certain special functions (the cure of souls, the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments) was said to be their "high honour and responsibility". In matters relating to Church government the ordained, although said to be "associated" with the laity, were to be reserved a "supreme place". This was to be "supremely so" in matters of direct spiritual leadership. Finally, the lay orders continued to be referred to as

---

30 Ibid.

31 MAC, 1954, p.183.

"auxiliary" forms of ministry,[32] with all the connotations of being less than equal that were contained in that.

The Church's ideas about the equality and interdependence of all within its universal ministry certainly had the potential to undermine its co-existent vision of ministry as hierarchy. However, when that vision was eventually overturned, it seems to have been due just as much to certain pragmatic considerations as it was to any theological reflection.

The position of the lay orders within the ministry of the Church underwent some radical changes from the late-1950s. Questions began to be asked about their status generally when the Law Revision Committee became involved in discussion on the representation of deaconesses and home missionaries at Conference.

The Committee produced reports in 1957 and 1958 pointing to an anomaly in the representation of the lay orders. Both orders had the right to elect two of their members to represent them at Conference. However, deaconesses were also allowed to go as lay representatives for any circuits, boards or committees in, or of which they were members. Home missionaries did not have this right. The Law Revision Committee believed that neither should be eligible for election as such lay representatives because neither, it said, could really effectively represent the view of the laity. In its opinion both, as full-time paid

---

32 Ibid. pp.183-4.

workers and as "integral parts of the Church in its preaching, pastoral and sacramental work", were "set apart as it were from the laity".[33] Its 1958 report even went so far as to say that both "do the work of the Ministry and will naturally have a ministerial outlook".[34]

The Conference, however, led by the President of 1957-8, D.O. Williams, did not agree with the Committee's recommendation that members of neither order be eligible as lay representatives. Instead, "it would end the anomaly the other way round" [35] - that is, by liberalising the representation of deaconesses and home missionaries. This it did in 1959. The law was amended to allow home missionaries to be elected as lay representatives to Conference; the Deaconess Order was given an additional two representatives; and the principle that home missionaries and deaconesses in the active work all be given seats as ministerial, rather than lay, representatives was referred for consideration to the Faith and Order Committee.[36]

The failure of the Law Revision Committee to tighten up the representation of the lay orders, and the changes - although initially small - made to improve that representation show that there was a desire within the Church to give them better recognition. The Committee had

---

33 Ibid. 1947, p.195.

34 Ibid. 1958, p.204.

35 New Zealand Methodist Times, [hereafter NZMT], 1958, December 6, p.436.

36 MAC, 1959, p.206.

contributed to that recognition by acknowledging that home missionaries and deaconesses really were integral parts of the Church's ministry. They had a ministerial character.

The day of the home missionary order, however, was nearly over. Sometime around 1958 the decision was made to ordain all but a few of the senior home missionaries and to phase out the order itself.[37] In 1960 Conference decided that, in future, only two types of men would be sought for home mission status. They would be experienced laymen who, on early retirement from other employment, could offer some years of active full-time service to the Church; or men who wanted to test themselves in the work before offering as candidates for the ordained ministry.[38]

It is difficult to know how long the Church had been considering such action, or whether the decline in the number of European home missionaries, which began in the late 1940s, should be seen as cause or effect. In 1940 there were 50 European home missionaries, in 1950 there were 41, and in 1960 only 27.[39] There were at least two other possible reasons for the decision. Firstly, there was a desire within the Church to replace home missionaries with ministers trained in the Theological College. It was felt in 1960 that this objective had been "largely attained" and that the Church would now only need a smaller number of home

---

37 E.W. Hames, Coming of Age, The United Church 1913-1972, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.28, Nos.1 & 2, 1974) p.113.

38 MAC, 1960, p.160.

39 See Table 1.

missionaries fulfilling a "supply ministry".[40] Secondly, according to J.J. Lewis, the Church wanted to turn its back upon any idea of grades of ministry. It was no longer comfortable having "auxiliary" or subordinate forms of ministry.[41] This may have been inspired by an attack of theological conscience. Hames, however, suggests that it stemmed from the Church's renewed realisation that, in an ecumenical scene, it was still in an awkward position by allowing those who were not ordained to administer the sacraments. Methodists had been "sacrificing principle to expediency." Once Union discussions began in the late 1950s, however, and " we found ourselves in serious dialogue with older Communions it was obvious we must mend our ways."[42] Thus the home missionary order was to disappear.

The position of the Deaconess Order increasingly came under question during this time. Concerns had been growing since the late 1930s. In 1941 young women from the Bible Class movement expressed the feeling that the Order had lost some of its appeal amongst the educated women of the Church. They based this on questions about training, security of employment and renumeration.[43] This problem was accentuated from the late 1940s, when the Church made the decision to admit women into the ordained ministry. A

---

40 MAC, 1960, p.160.

41 J.J. Lewis, The Trinity College Story, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.31, Nos. 3 & 4, October 1978), p.35.

42 Hames, Coming of Age, p.113.

43 NZMT, 1941, March 8,. p.364.

further lessening of interest in the Order was inevitable. Yet more problems arose during the 1950s as there seemed to be a merging of the roles of deaconess and ordained minister.[44] Many deaconesses were exercising a preaching and wide pastoral function, and being authorised in special situations to administer the sacraments.[45] This was "the thin end of a wedge that at that time was not conceived."[46] Single deaconesses on low stipends were an economical alternative to the ordained that some circuits were very happy to accept. However, with the essential difference between deaconesses and ordained ministers thus obscured, the status of the Order was called into question.[47]

All of these problems were picked up in the first report of the Commission on the Ministry of Women, appointed in 1962 to investigate both the type of ministry and the practical problems that ordained women would have. The Commission called the Deaconess Order the "outstanding problem". There was wide agreement, it said, that the standard of training and the status of deaconesses should be improved. But if this were done, how then were they to be distinguished from ordained women ministers? Once again the question was asked, "Is the Deaconess Order lay or ministerial?"[48]

---

44 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, pp.13-14.

45 Wesley A. Chambers, Not Self - But Others, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, No.48, August 1987) p.35.

46 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.14.

47 Chambers, p.35.

The Commission's answer, in its report of the following year, echoed that of the Law Revision Committee in the late 1950s. Deaconesses, it said, exercised a ministry of service on behalf of the Church. Their's was a ministerial rather than a lay order. Not everyone agreed with this, however, nor with the Commission's conclusion that it would therefore be appropriate for deaconesses to be ordained "by prayer and the laying-on of hands".[49] The Wellington and North Canterbury Synods both objected; North Canterbury asserting that the Order was a lay one, and that the report contained "theological confusion...concerning the relationship of ordination in the Ministry of Word and Sacrament and the Order of Deaconesses as a serving Order."[50] This opposition resulted in the Faith and Order Committee being asked to confer on that whole section of the report with the Deaconess Board.

The rest of the report, however, did find favour with Conference. It addressed the training of deaconesses, declaring that with "the rising level of education in the community only the best that the Church can provide is adequate." This was the feeling that had helped lead to the phasing-out of the home missionaries. Here, however, it was behind the proposal that deaconesses be transferred from Deaconess House in Christchurch to be trained with students

---

48 MAC, 1963, p.241.

49 Ibid. 1964, p.212.

50 Journal of the Methodist Annual Conference, [hereafter Journal] 1964 (no page number available here)

for the ordained ministry at the Theological College. This would give both groups a "community of learning large enough to provide adequate group stimulus", and it would help prepare them for the partnership in ministry they would share after training.[51] Conference agreed that this should begin as soon as arrangements could conveniently be made, and the first deaconess, Ruth Tattersall, entered College in 1968.[52]

The Faith and Order Committee, as asked, produced in 1965 a statement on the nature and status of the Deaconess Order. In it the Order was no longer termed an "auxiliary". Instead deaconesses were recognised as being a part of the Church's ministry in their own right. Like those within the Ministry of Word and Sacrament they were said to belong to the "special yet diverse ministry" of pastoral care - an expression of the calling to specific service and leadership within the Church. For them this included conducting worship, evangelism, teaching, and training for leadership and service. Because deaconesses were called to ministry, and because this involved life-long commitment, the Faith and Order Committee (like those before it) judged their order to have a ministerial rather than lay character. It too considered ordination to be appropriate.[53]

---

51 MAC, 1964, p.212.

52 Ibid. 1968, p.231.

53 Ibid. 1965, p.283.

Once again this latter proposal faced opposition. The North Canterbury Synod wanted it referred back for further study in view of Church Union negotiations and the "disquiet" raised by the meaning of ordination.[54] This seems to have been a lone voice however, for the report was adopted. In 1968 twenty-one deaconesses (those in active service and a few who were retired) were ordained.

One problem still remained - the very issue that had sparked off this debate a decade before. The question of the representation of deaconesses had still to be resolved and, as the Commission noted in 1964, was more urgent in the light of their newly recognised ministerial character.[55] So in 1968 the Deaconess Board inquired whether deaconesses should now be members of the Ministerial Sessions of Synod, where, at the moment, questions were asked about their Christian character and effectiveness in their absence. Should they be members of Conference? In the Board's opinion, the present representation of the Order was still based on the concept of it being an auxiliary, rather than a distinct, form of ministry.

> New insights are teaching the Church to place the orders of ministry within the framework of the total ministry of the Church, and "side by side" rather than in hierarchical ascendancy.[56]

So in 1969 the Church decided that deaconesses should be given the right to attend the District Ministerial

---

54 Journal, 1965, p.237.

55 MAC, 1964, p.211.

56 Ibid. 1968, pp.234-6.

Committee of their local Synods, and to speak on all matters except those relating to the selection and training of the Ministry. Only so far was their ministerial character acknowledged and their representation improved, however, for they were still not members of Conference. The main obstacle to this was that, ministerial or ordained, deaconesses were still not considered to be in full connexion. Thus, so far as their relationship to Conference was concerned they were still lay representatives.[57]

By the late 1960s, therefore, the Church had revised some of its ideas about the relationship between its lay orders and the ordained. Its concept of ministry had been widened and made more inclusive. The orders themselves, however, were still disappearing. There were only 10 European home missionaries in 1970, of whom 7 were retired. Deaconess numbers had also fallen, from 43 in 1960 to 29 in 1970.[58] This decline may have been one reason behind two new and linked developments in the thought of the Church that appeared from the late 1960s. The Church began to seriously consider establishing an order of deacons. It also began to reflect on how the concept of "diakonia" related to ministry.

The establishment of a new diaconate had been considered more than once within the Church. The idea was raised in 1949, briefly in 1958 by the Welfare of the Church

---

57 Ibid. 1969, pp.272-3.

58 See Table 1.

Committee, and then again in 1967 by the Board of Examiners. An ordained order of deacons was envisaged in the churches' Plan for Union, published in 1969 and 1971. The nature of this order was deliberately left very open. On the one hand "everything was thrown in that could possibly help to create a meaningful order."[59] So, for example, it was thought that it might include those who were already deaconesses; workers in Church social service agencies, offices and other spheres of Church employment; those accepted for training for the presbyterate; as well as "men and women in whom the Church recognises a vocation to and aptness for service and who wish explicitly to exercise such gifts in the name of the Church." The new deacons' task was seen as being "to help the Church to be present for costly service to others where the need is greatest and to pioneer that costly service." Such service could be expressed in a variety of ways; for example, through social service, preaching, teaching, exercising pastoral care, or having responsibilities in public worship. On the other hand, however, the Plan acknowledged that it wanted to leave room - room for future development, and room so that deacons would have sufficient freedom to concentrate on specific tasks as they arose.[60] In other words it was trying to make an "imaginative approach to ministry rather than just a compromise to accommodate all the partners."[61]

---

59 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, pp.32-3.

60 Plan for Union, Joint Commission for Church Union, 1971, pp.44-5.

61 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.33.

Although the union negotiations had faltered by the mid-1970s the Methodist Church continued to consider the introduction of a diaconate.

In 1969 the Faith and Order Committee had declared that "within the scope of the one ministry of the Church there is room for an order which might well be called the "Diaconate"." However, its vision was much more limited than the one in the Plan for Union - it might even be called tame in comparison - for its diaconate was not to be any kind of pioneering costly service. Instead it was to be "a domestic ministry within the church", and "auxiliary to the Presbyterate. (Such as is already being exercised by Deaconesses.)"[62] This last comment indicates that the change plotted in the Church's attitude towards its non-presbyteral ministries may not everywhere have been as advanced as it might seem.

The assumption that a new diaconate would fulfill a limited and even subordinate role was certainly not shared by the Deaconess Board. It set out a much more challenging position in its report on the "Theological Basis of the Deaconess Order" in 1973.

In this report the Board argued that the Methodist understanding of ministry had, in the past, been basically presbyteral. That is, ministry had been seen as something that presbyters do - preaching, administering the sacraments and fulfilling the pastoral office. Consequently, the

---

62 MAC, 1969, p.298.

diaconate had been left in "a subordinate and far from satisfactory position." Deaconesses had not been seen as being integral to ministry. Recently however, said the Board, there had been a "reorientation of thinking about ministry" - "a deepening theological conviction that the Church has one ministry, namely that which is derived from the servanthood of Christ." The Plan for Union observed that Jesus said, "I came not to be served but to serve." If ministry was service, the diaconate - as the ministry of service - was thus "the basic Ministry". All others - the presbyterate and the episcopate - were therefore to be considered as special forms of diaconate. They were special forms of the basic ministry of service. According to this argument, the diaconate was definitely no auxiliary - it was the very heart of ministry.[63]

This debate was furthered by the production of two reports in 1975. One came from the Deaconess Board, which had been asked to look at the distinctions between the diaconate and the presbyterate. The other was from the Faith and Order Committee and sought to collate the thought and work of the various groups that had been considering aspects of forms of ministry in the 1970s. The two shared some common ideas.

Both, like the Board two years before, grounded their concept of ministry firmly in the serving ministry of Jesus. "There is only one Christian ministry", said the

---

63 Ibid. 1973, pp.259-60.

Faith and Order Committee, "Christ's ministry of reconciliation and of creative purpose in, to, and for the world."[64] Christ, as the Deaconess Board pointed out, was a man "deeply conscious of himself as servant (diakonos)."[65] His ministry of service, of "the towel and basin", is for the Church its basic ministry. All share in it and all other ministries originate from it.[66]

The two saw other forms of ministry - the particular ministries of the ordained and the lay - as lying within this one ministry. The Faith and Order Committee considered each to be a focus of the Church's universal ministry, emphasising particular aspects of concern and task. Its view of the task of the diaconate had changed since 1969. Now, like the Deaconess Board, it drew from ideas within the Plan for Union to see the diaconate as "a reminder to the Church of its ministry of costly service", operating "both within and beyond the church at the cutting edge of mission."[67]

Finally, the reports envisaged for the diaconate a life-long vocation (though not necessarily a life-long jurisdiction); appropriate training; ordination; and a variety of forms of service. The Board, for example, included "liturgical forms" like the conduct of worship and

---

64 Ibid. 1975, p.254.

65 Ibid. p.239.

66 Ibid.

67 Ibid. pp.254-5.

preaching, and "practical forms" like Christian education and chaplaincy work. Both also considered that the diaconate would be open to men and women.

These reports were referred back to their parent bodies, which were asked to present a single report, in the light of church discussion, the following year. So in 1976 the Faith and Order Committee, under the chairmanship of J.J. Lewis, presented the report, "Diversity in Ministry", which was to significantly alter the shape of the whole Methodist ministry.

In this the Church was reminded that discussions concerning the role and future of its Deaconess Order had been taking place for some years, and that the search for a renewal of the diaconate in general was occurring world-wide. The New Zealand Church, it said, could not ignore that world-wide impulse. In the Committee's opinion, broadening the membership of the Methodist diaconate to include men (which would bring them into line with the larger Church) "would be a first step as we share in that exploration." It admitted that it did not know what the result of such a decision would be (whether or not, for example, the existing Deaconess Order would remain as a sisterhood within an extended diaconate); and it recognised that some in the Church were hesitant about such an action. However, it still thought that the Church should go ahead. It should listen to and be guided both by those confessing a call in the direction of such a diaconate, and by the wider

Church for the new insights and understandings it could share.[68]

Like others within the Church, in thinking about the nature of the diaconate, the Committee drew heavily from the Plan for Union, which it called "a useful starting point." It noted, then, that the Plan offered "not a subordinate but a supplementary and parallel form of ministry to that of the Presbyterate." It seems to have been the Committee's intention to create, in a Methodist diaconate, just such a form of ministry. So, again like others, it considered all orders of ministry to be sharing in the ministry of Jesus and participating in his servanthood. They were, then, to be distinguished not by status, but rather by function. The primary focus of the diaconate was, thus, defined by the Committee as being some particular service within and beyond the Church, like, for example, social service, administration, or some other specific task. The focus of the presbyterate, on the other hand, was stated to be the building-up of the congregation through preaching, the administration of the sacraments and pastoral care.[69]

The Committee's report found favour with the Conference, and in 1976 the resolution was passed creating a new Methodist diaconate, open to both men and women. The first to be accepted for training as a deacon was Edith Little, who was received in 1977, and ordained in the

---

68 Ibid. 1976, pp.264-5.

69 Ibid. pp.265-7.

following year. In 1978 John E. Bennett and Fisiga Tuimaseve became the first men to be accepted for training (the latter for the non-stipendiary diaconate). By 1980 there were already 20 Methodist deacons in ministry, and 5 students in training; these numbers had risen to 26 deacons and 7 students by 1987.[70]

The creation of the diaconate now allowed the final step to be taken in the long, slow movement by which the declining Deaconess Order drew closer to the presbyterate. In 1979 all but one of the seven remaining deaconesses in active work offered themselves as candidates for the presbyterate. As Mullan notes, this was not inappropriate, for "virtually all of them were in congregations or similar appointments where their style of ministry was already presbyteral rather than diaconal."[71] They were all accepted and ordained together in 1979.

The diaconate has come as the Church's most recent step in the long path travelled by the relationship between its ordained, sacramental ministry and its lay orders. In the diaconate, the Church's long-standing assurances of the equality of all within its universal ministry have gone some way to being fulfilled; for, as was determined from its inception, it may be seen to have been a full and equal order of ministry. One very tangible expression of this was

---

70 See Table 1.

71 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.16.

the Church's decision to pay its deacons and presbyters the same minimum stipend.

As noted, those in the Methodist Church's lay orders traditionally received lower stipends than those in its ordained ministry. This disparity - expressive of the Church's sense of the hierarchy within ministry - was one of the things to have, so far, survived the changes observed in its concepts of ministry. As late as 1976, then, while all Methodist ministers and probationers were receiving a minimum stipend of $5940, home missionaries were only being paid from between $4892 and $5415, and deaconesses from between $3830 and $4927, according to their marital status and/or length of service.[72] By this time, however, the Church was having to face some questions about this policy. In 1974 Conference passed a resolution suggesting that, as stipends were considered to be 'living allowances' only, and so unrelated to things like a minister's qualifications or responsibilities, the Stipends Committee should report on the principle of the payment of stipends to home and Maori missionaries, deaconesses and other church workers "on the same relative basis as for ministers and probationers." This was followed a year later by the suggestion that, as they were paid the lowest stipend of all, deaconesses were being discriminated against in terms of the Equal Pay Act of 1972-3.[73]

---

72 MAC, 1976, p.289.

73 Ibid. 1975, pp.292-3.

The Stipends Committee replied to this by stating, firstly, that it believed the improvement in stipend rates over recent years to have been such that the term 'living allowance' was no longer an appropriate one.[74] It was not, then, prepared to accept it as a ground for granting absolute parity between the ministerial orders. After consultations with the Faith and Order Committee, Maori Division, the Deaconess Board and the Development Division, however, the Committee was prepared to abolish the graded rates received by home missionaries and deaconesses, and to set their stipends at the highest of the rates now operating. There would thus be one minimum stipend for each order - $5415 for home missionaries and $4927 for deaconesses. However, although the consultations had agreed that they "could not see anything within the present Ministry or Deaconess Order that discriminates on the basis of sex", deaconesses were still being paid the lowest of the stipends.[75]

The question was brought to Conference again in 1977, when the Faith and Order Committee produced a report which supported the principle of parity on the grounds that it expressed the Church's belief in "the shared oneness of ministry". This involved, it said, the recognition that "there is always only one ministry", although its task may be exercised in a variety of ways, different gifts giving

---

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid. 1976, pp.288-9.

rise to different orders of ministry. This was an argument the Committee had, as seen, put more than once. No one of these gifts or orders of ministry is held to be more important than another, and so, suggested the Committee, "from a theological point of view, parity of stipend minima is appropriate." Unlike the Stipends Committee, the Faith and Order Committee thus affirmed the stipend as a living allowance, "decided primarily on the basis of what it costs to live", and determined "without regard to status, order or gift". It did agree that the payment of certain "secondary adjustments" or allowances might be necessary, and it acknowledged that achieving parity might involve hardship for some circuits or divisions. However, in its opinion, the Church as a whole had "a responsibility...to facilitate the implementation of this principle."[76]

The Church, however, was still not ready to do so. The Committee's report was sent to Synods, which gave it a mixed response. Its proposal that, as a general principle, parity was to be affirmed, was received and adopted by 4 Synods, approved by another 2 (who emphasised that this was in principle only) and returned by the remaining 4 without comment or recommendation.[77] In the following year the Stipends Committee re-affirmed its earlier conclusions, stating that stipend parity was not appropriate, for it implied like work with the same study and qualifications.

---

76 Ibid. 1977, pp.260-1.

77 Ibid. p.261.

The Committee believed stipends should reflect these things - where they were different, "suitable relativity should apply as in other occupations."[78]

Only a year later, however, the Committee had apparently changed its mind, for, after consultations held in 1979 to determine the renumeration and allowances of the non-stipendiary ministry and the diaconate, it was to recommend to Conference that "the same minimum stipend...apply both to Ministers and Deacons". The recommendation was based, firstly, on an acknowledgement of the conditions of ministry shared by both orders. The Committee noted, for example, that both went through the same selection process, and that both faced the same discipline and accountability when ordained. It was also based upon the recognition that members of the diaconate had some areas of special need. It had been explained, said the Committee, that where candidates for the presbyterate were usually young people, those for the diaconate were often experienced in other occupations, and were not guarenteed appointments. For these sorts of reasons, the Stipends Committee now considered parity of stipends to be appropriate.[79]

The Church's decision to pay its deacons and presbyters the same minimum stipend may be seen as something of a symbol for its conviction that the new diaconate is

---

78 Ibid. 1978, p.247.

79 Ibid. 1979, pp.185-7.

indeed an equal order of ministry. It is not seen as an auxiliary or as a stepping stone on the way to 'real' ministry. Instead it is considered a separate, distinct and authentic form of ministry in its own right.

CHAPTER 2

FORMS OF ORDAINED MINISTRY

As the Methodist Church initiated new forms of diaconal ministry, changes were also occurring within its presbyterate. In the 1880s Methodist ministers were invariably full-time, fully stipendiary, and based in the circuit. By the 1980s, however, they were able to work in a variety of extra-parish situations (for both church and "secular" organisations), within teams, and on all sorts of part-time and self-supporting bases. This was a change born partly of necessity, as the Church discovered that its older form of ministry just could not be maintained. It was also, however, due to a change in its ideas as to what constituted a true or valid form of ordained ministry. The Church moved from holding a very rigid view of the presbyterate - a view that allowed for little variation - to one that was much more flexible and open to many kinds of experiment and diversification.

In the late nineteenth century most of the New Zealand Methodist Church's ordained ministers were stationed in local parishes. There were only a few exceptions. There were those who held full-time administrative positions within the Church; like for example, William Morley, appointed the first Connexional Secretary in 1893, and T.G. Brooke, who became the first Organising Secretary of the

Home Mission Department in 1909. There were a few who taught in the Church's educational institutions; like for example, Alexander Reid, the Principal of the joint "Native" and Theological Institution, Wesley College, Three Kings, between 1885 and 1891. There were also some who offered for foreign mission work; five ministers were transferred overseas for that purpose between 1880 and 1900.[1]

Chaplaincies were the first new form of the ordained ministry to be accepted by the Church. Provision was made as early as 1904 for the appointment of "certain resident ministers" as chaplains of public institutions in the different centres of population.[2] These, however, were purely part-time, voluntary and denominational. The first chaplaincies to be put on a more regular basis were those to the military. Methodist ministers served as full-time chaplains at home and overseas in both world wars. Among these, William Walker was Chaplain to the Forces at Trentham Camp, and Frederick T. Read served on a hospital ship during the first; while Victor R. Jamieson served in Greece and the Western Desert, and John Churchill was the first Air Force Chaplain in the Pacific during the second. However it was not until the 1950s that moves were made to have chaplaincies in general more widely extended and regularised. Gradually the Methodist Church became involved in a range of full-time, paid and ecumenical chaplaincies.

---

1 See Table 2.

2 MAC, 1904, p.78.

Regular services were conducted and pastoral visitation undertaken by Methodist ministers in New Zealand prisons for example. In 1950, however, the Welfare of the Church Committee was convinced that a more satisfactory method should be devised for such visitation and for the appointment of chaplains. So it was resolved that Synods nominate a person to be chaplain within their area, and that the Minister of Justice be approached for a more satisfactory recognition of such appointments.[3] This came when in 1955 the Justice Department decided to augment the work of voluntary chaplains by appointing part-time prison chaplains wherever possible. These would be "official chaplains" - members of the prison staff in full status, with access to all inmates at any time, and receiving a small honorarium from the State. The Church gave its "hearty approval" to the idea and was willing that its ministers serve in this capacity.[4] The first to do so was Leslie Clements, who was part-time National Council of Churches Chaplain to the Invercargill Borstal, and then Senior Chaplain to prisons between 1956 and 1960.[5]

The Church was not at first in favour of the appointment of chaplains to general hospitals other than by individual communions. It thought that it might disturb the "permanent pastoral relationship" between the minister and

---

3 Ibid. 1950, p.49, 52.

4 Ibid. 1955, pp.60-2.

5 Ibid. 1980, p.427.

his or her people. (This did not apply to mental hospitals, where the term of residence was longer and the cost might be borne by the government.)[6] In 1959 however, the Spiritual Healing Committee pointed out that both the Anglicans and the Presbyterians had appointed full-time hospital chaplains in a number of places. A Methodist minister in Christchurch, H.G. Brown, had also been working as a part-time chaplain for over a year. His work had been successful and the need was felt to consolidate it with a full-time appointment. So the Church approved the principle of full-time hospital chaplaincies, thinking that they could be best set up on an ecumenical basis, preferably through the National Council of Churches.[7] The N.C.C. though, did not respond to these suggestions. It was not until 1968 that the first Methodist full-time hospital chaplain, Francis Parker, was appointed. He had to be jointly financed by the Auckland District and the Home Mission Department. However, in 1971 an Interchurch Advisory Council on Hospital Chaplains was established which began negotiations with the Health Department.[8] In 1972 the Government agreed to make available subsidies to assist the churches in the establishment and maintenance of hospital chaplaincies.[9]

---

6 Ibid. 1953, p.75.

7 Ibid. 1959, p.80, 84.

8 Ibid. 1971, p.246.

9 Ibid. 1972, p.190.

The first Methodist university chaplain so far found was Haddon Dixon, who was the Student Christian Movement Chaplain at the Auckland University College between 1949 and 1952.[10] The Church declared that it supported the appointment of ecumenical chaplains to universities and training colleges in 1961. It was thought that the present need for full-time chaplains in most university centres would increase as did university populations - student numbers were to double in the 1960s.[11] So in 1969 Phyllis Guthardt became full-time chaplain at the Waikato University, and the following year Donald Phillips was appointed to the Otago University. The decision was made in 1970 to finance such chaplaincies on a national basis through the National Council of Churches.[12]

Finally, in 1962 the report of a consultation on "The Ministry of the Church in Industrial Areas", organised by the Home Mission Department, suggested that there might occasionally be a need for isolated full-time industrial chaplaincies; in, for example, temporary large-scale projects away from ordinary pastoral appointments.[13] It was in just such a context that Methodist industrial mission began. In 1965 Owen Kitchingham was appointed to Manapouri under the Southland branch of the National Council of

---

10 Ibid. 1978, p.34.

11 Ibid. 1961, p.82.

12 Ibid. 1970, p.207.

13 Ibid. 1962, p.268.

Churches. He then went to serve as an industrial chaplain in Christchurch and became the director, between 1970 and 1974, of the pilot scheme that evolved into the Inter-Church Trade and Industry Mission (I.T.I.M.).

The early 1970s, then, saw a range of chaplaincies well under way. By 1980 eight Methodist ministers were in chaplaincy work.[14] In granting its permission for its ministers to be involved in this work the Church was agreeing that they were forms of a true ministry. This was admitted by Church Council as early as 1960, when chaplaincies were recognised as "coming within the categories of service which can thus be approved by the Conference."[15]

At this time, however, other forms of service were still viewed with more caution. In 1960 Church Council defined a minister of the New Zealand Methodist Church as:

> ..one who has heard the call of God and whom the Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit accepts and sets apart by ordination to the office and work of the ministry.

That ordination was said to be "full-time God-given work". Therefore it ought to be:

> ..something very special that leads a man to enter work outside that regular ministry. And the Church can allow a man to enter such work only after the most careful examination of all the circumstances.[16]

---

14 See Table 2.

15 MAC, 1960, p.78.

16 Ibid. p.77.

The Church had been granting permission for small numbers of its ministers to serve with outside organisations since the end of the last century. Leonard Isitt was released to work for the temperance movement between 1893 and 1894 for example; A.B. Chappell became Registrar of the Auckland University College in 1917; and Ernest Blamires worked as General-Secretary of the Bible-in-Schools League between 1935 and 1945.[17] However, that permission was never easy to secure. Those who sought it in the early 1960s still had to satisfy the Conference annually that their service could still be regarded as "a true ministry of the Word and Sacraments". The onus was on them to produce the evidence that their work was of such a character. If Conference could not be so persuaded the minister concerned had two choices. He or she could either resign from the ministry, or elect to be treated as a minister without pastoral charge, who had "entered into business". The latter involved the loss of full ministerial status - those concerned were to be considered as accredited local preachers only, with the right to attend the District Synod but not the District Ministerial Committee or Conference (unless elected as a lay representative). Their names would appear in the Journal of Conference, but not in the printed Minutes.[18]

---

17 See Table 2.

18 MAC, 1963, pp.237-8.

19 Ibid. 1965, p.93.

The Church did not yet, then, go out of its way to encourage its ministers to take up forms of ministry beyond the Church. This attitude was soon to change, however, as two separate statements of 1965 reveal.

The first, from Church Council, declared that there was likely to be an increasing number of new forms of ministry, and that the Church "must constantly be open to further insights as to avenues of service". So it set out some general principles, which included expecting a "reasonable maturity and experience of the Church" from those applying for such special positions.[19]

The second, from the Faith and Order Committee, set out some of the theological reasoning behind the Church's change of heart. It began (like so many Methodist arguments) by affirming that all who are members within the church share in its universal ministry - all, in a sense, are ministers. Thus, rigid judgements about what is, or is not, ministry are not possible. It is not possible, for example, to make hard and fast distinctions between "the 'world-centred calling of the layman and the church-centred function of the set apart clergy' for they participate in each other and distinctions are blurred." Here the Committee was acknowledging a flexibility within ministry. The concept of the ministry of the word and sacraments could not, therefore, be tied to preaching. There were other options also. Although the Committee admitted that there were factors to be safeguarded when thinking about

specialised ministries - in particular, that they were ministries of pastoral care, and that ministers remained as representatives of the Church, under its discipline and at its disposal - it still felt that it should be possible to give to these a flexible interpretation in individual cases where that seemed desirable. Finally, the Church, declared the Committee, should take up an active role and be prepared "to initiate and approve ministries which although experimental, are undertaken in obedience to the Lord of the church."[20]

Thus a more flexible understanding of the nature of ministry itself - one that was prepared to allow much more to be ministry - led the Church to regard alternative forms of ordained ministry with a more kindly eye.

There were also, however, some more practical reasons behind the Church's change of heart. It was entering, in the late 1960s, a period of some crisis.

This was a time, firstly, when congregations began to decline. The number of Methodist church members grew rapidly in the 1950s (by 19.87% between 1950 and 1960), but more slowly in the early 1960s (by only 4.61% between 1960 and 1965). Membership then began to fall in the late 1960s (by 4.65% from 1965 to 1970), and plunged very sharply in the early 1970s (by 15.09% from 1970 to 1975).[21] This, combined with rising costs during this period, meant that

---

20 Ibid. p.282.

21 These statistics are worked out from Church membership figures given in Lineham, pp.38-9.

some parishes would no longer be able to support the traditional pattern of a full-time, fully paid minister. They could no longer afford it.

The late 1960s and early 1970s saw a similar decline in the number of ordained ministers. The 1950s had been a time of strong growth, the number of Methodist clergy increasing by 22.59% from 239 in 1950 to 293 in 1960. This slowed down and then stopped altogether in the 1960s however - in the first half of the decade the number of clergy rose by 7.51% to 315 in 1965, in the second half it remained static. In the early 1970s the number of clergy fell by 6.03% (the largest decline so far recorded) to finish at 296 by 1975.[22] One factor in this decline was the large numbers of clergy who were quitting the ministry to, as Mullan puts it, "engage in more 'relevant' vocations in education and social work and the secular society."[23] Increasing numbers resigned outright - 4 between 1960 and 1964, 5 between 1965 and 1969, and 16 between 1970 and 1974.[24]

Overall, then, the Methodist Church had fewer ministers, but, around this time, it also had even less available for local parishes as more and more of its clergy found work in other areas of church life. In 1960, for example, 4 Methodist ministers were working for other organisations in New Zealand and overseas, and another 2

---

22 See Table 4.

23 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.18.

24 See Table 5.

were resting or without pastoral charge. By 1970 16 ministers were with other organisations, 2 were working in some trade, profession or business, and another 5 were resting or without pastoral charge.[25]

So by the late 1960s and early 1970s the Church had both less money and fewer clergy available for its traditional pattern of full-time, fully paid parish ministry. From sheer necessity it might be forced to consider more favourably the introduction of alternative forms of ordained ministry. This, together with the theological developments noted in 1965, was to be the backdrop against which the suggestions and changes of the next ten years would be made.

In 1966 the Welfare of the Church Committee was presented with a long list of suggested changes to the forms of the Church's ministry. From the beginning a strong link was made with the practical needs of the Church; at the very top of the list the Committee was asked to consider the "struggle Circuits with small membership have...in meeting their financial commitments."[26]

The suggestions included the development, in time, of an Order of Worker Priests. This Catholic movement began on the Continent and made priests into ordinary workers, seeking to be the Church out in the workplace. It was believed by many to be a bold and exciting new way for the Church world-wide. In the meantime, though, the New Zealand

---

25 See Table 2.

26 MAC, 1966, p.67.

Methodist Church was asked to consider permitting some of its ministers to undertake part-time secular employment. Mullan suggests that these sorts of ideas were seen as creative ways of solving some of the Church's problems. It was thought that the presbyteral skills of those leaving, or wanting to leave, the Church for other occupations might be used on a part-time, paid or unpaid basis for small parishes with only a modest need for ordained ministry but unable to manage without any at all.[27] This was not spelt out in the suggestions, but changes to ministry were certainly seen as a matter of survival. It was suggested, for example, that specialist ministries might "meet more completely than can the present type of ministry the needs of the whole community, and therefore [help] to recover both the relevance of the Church and the support of people in general." So it was proposed that the training of the ministry be geared, and the structure of circuits be changed to permit more specialization. Finally the Committee was asked to consider the more rapid promotion of union causes in small-town and rural areas, and even the handing over of Methodist work in such places to other denominations.[28]

The Welfare of the Church Committee did not respond enthusiastically to all of these ideas. It did admit that certain churches were having financial problems and that, in some places, the task of maintaining financial solvency was

---

27 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.18.

28 MAC, 1966, p.67.

a "consuming concern". However, it did not see such problems as a reason for changing any of the Church's forms of ministry. It would not admit the need for so drastic a solution. It would much rather the churches concerned held stewardship campaigns, or applied for subsidies or adjustments to their levels of financial commitment.[29]

The Committee did not view the specialist ministries suggested with any favour. It saw them instead as threats to the traditional concept of the work of ordained ministry. In its opinion the Church was already committed to specialist ministries, with its clergy working as chaplains and directors of church departments. The "demand today is not for more..." of these it said, "but for better trained and equipped circuit ministers." Arguing against allowing ministers to undertake part-time secular employment, the Committee said that some people were assuming that it was only by meeting a person at their place of work that the relevance of the Gospel could be related to them. However, "the traditional view of the pastoral ministry has been to emphasise the home as the prime unit to be concentrated on." And so it should continue to be. For there the minister came into contact with "the whole spectrum of occupations represented by the people on his pastoral roll."[30]

The Committee also thought that it was being assumed that the barrier between the clergy and the world was the

---

29 Ibid. 1967, pp.69-70.

30 Ibid. pp.71-2.

professional role of the clergy. Its view, however, was that, far from being inhibiting, this role gave the clergy an objectivity in, for example, the world of work, which allowed them to transcend divisions and distinctions, and to minister to every section of the working community. Ministers engaging in part-time secular employment however, would inevitably find themselves typed as belonging to either management or workers, and thus their ministry would be sharply defined.[31]

Thus the Welfare of the Church Committee was not in favour of major changes to the form of the Church's ordained ministry - it considered them to be neither necessary nor desirable. However, it did recognise a need for some clarification of the concept of ordination itself. It could see that some people were suspicious of ordination, feeling that it was being used to set apart or exalt the clergy. This produced, by way of reaction, a desire to move outside the role of ordained minister. The Committee, though, believed that ordination was "not a distinction of status but of function." It was "the continuation of a professional ministry entrusted with the task of effectively doing those things entrusted to its care...." So it recommended that the Faith and Order Committee spend some time clarifying the Church's position on ordination and confirmation (as something expressing the individual's involvement in the caring ministry of the Church).[32]

---

31 Ibid.

The Committee also asked that questions about union and co-operation be asked at Quarterly Meetings, District Synods, and Synod Standing Committees on the occasion of visitations. Questions must have been asked somewhere for it was in the late 1960s that the rapid development of union and co-operating ventures occurred. Methodists were involved in 5 such parishes in 1965, and 32 by 1970.[33] This pooling of resources did ease the financial problems of some parishes, but it did not necessarily create 'stronger' units (there were nearly always members who were unwilling to unite), and it really only put off the spectre of inflation for a few more years.[34] The problem of financial viability would remain.

The call for alternative forms of ordained ministry was renewed in 1969 in the Faith and Order Committee's annual report on the ministry of the Church. The Committee declared that the principal responsibility of presbyters was as defined by the traditional formula of the ministry of Word, Sacraments and Pastoral Care. But it held that there was a need "to provide for diversity within...[that]... presbyterate." It suggested four forms of presbyteral ministry. Two of these - full-time domestic church service, which, the Committee reassured, was essential for the welfare of the Church; and full-time work in secular fields,

---

32 Ibid. p.72.

33 These figures come from the list of stations in MAC, 1965, pp.44-55, and Ibid. 1970, pp.75-87.

34 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.17.

like, for example, various kinds of chaplaincies and secular emplyment approved by the Church - were already under way. The third was a combination of both part-time Church-centred service and part-time chaplaincy or secular work. The fourth was engagement in secular employment while being recognised as a representative of the Church and authorised to perform the functions of a presbyter. The report explicitly stated that these last two forms were "to be sanctioned and facilitated as expressions of the ministry of the church."[35]

The Faith and Order Committee was in favour of diversity in ministry. It was in favour of forming and, if necessary, reforming the Order of the Church in order to ensure "a truly apostolic ministry" and "to sanction and encourage experiment in mission."[36] Conference was now prepared to consider such change. So it resolved that a special committee, to be convened by Dr.P. Guthardt, be appointed to "investigate both the desirability and feasibility of alternative forms of ordained ministry with recommendation...as to how such ministries may find expression within the connexion."[37]

That committee produced its report, "Forms of Ordained Ministry", in 1970. Its argument recognised both theological changes and practical realities. Ordination, it

---

35 MAC, 1969, p.296.

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid. p.299.

pointed out, was traditionally thought of as commissioning a person for ministry in a specific field, usually considered in terms of a parish. For some time though, various specialised fields had also been recognised (the growing chaplaincy work for example) and the Church had no difficulty in accepting such as valid expressions of the pastoral ministry. Now the committee believed that it was time for the Church to be recognising new forms. There had been, it said, a re-thinking of the roles of ordained minister caused by both theological and sociological developments. So some ministers were wanting to move into new fields of service which were "not always so clearly seen as lying within the sphere of the ministry of the past." But the Church was in a changing world, a world which might demand new forms of ministry. It had to adapt if it was going to survive, and "not just to survive but to be effective." Thus the report contained a healthy dose of pragmatism, and a realisation that the Church had to plan for the future. Its conclusion was that of the Faith and Order Committee in 1965 and 1969 - the Church had to be flexible, so that people might "more readily move into and out of parish work as opportunity calls."[38]

The committee could see a variety of ways in which ministers might move in and out of parish work. These built on the suggestions of the past five years. For example, ministers might take up part-time employment, and here the

---

38 Ibid. 1970, pp.312-13.

committee thought that there would be situations "where this may be clearly desirable and practicable without...in any sense contracting out of the ministry as we have thought of it in the past." Or they might take up full-time secular employment for just a part of the year, perhaps as a 'rest' period - "partly for...[their]...own refreshment, partly to enable...[them]...to keep in contact with the world in a way not ordinarily possible ..." for them. Or they might take up secular employment while serving the Church at the same time, entering such employment primarily as workers, but perhaps becoming, in time, pastors to those with whom they worked. The committee could also see that modifications to the traditional pattern of parish work were likely to increase and to be of benefit. One that it considered to have much potential, for example, was the concept of team ministries, which would include both ordained and lay workers.[39]

Finally, after all of this talk about the role of the ordained, the committee made a special point of affirming the place of the laity within the ministry of the Church. Like others around this time the committee believed that "too often in the past" ordination had been seen as an act creating distinctions and bestowing special status within the Church. It was concerned "lest the understanding of the laity as the basic serving and responsible body of the Church be debased."[40] This, as noted in Chapter One,

---

39 Ibid. p.313.

was the kind of thinking to be contained within the Plan for Union of the following year, and taken up by those debating the introduction of a new Methodist diaconate.

In its report the committee expressed the hope that schemes for alternative forms of ministry would be put forward for consideration by people interested in pursuing them and by Synods aware of needs within their districts. The 1970 Conference passed a number of resolutions by which it hoped to encourage and enable such schemes. For example, the Pastoral Committee was asked to take "particular care" of people involved in specialist ministries. Relevant committees (for example, the Standing Committee on Stipends and the Supernumerary Fund Board) were asked to consider the various financial aspects involved in specialist ministries. The Department of Christian Education was requested to prepare resources for facilitating local dialogues on ministry, and to arrange for a lay-clergy consultation on their findings. Finally, because the Conference believed the concept of team ministry to be "a viable pattern of ministry today", it asked that information and ideas about establishing such ministries be gathered and disseminated.[41]

The next decade saw more ministers entering such alternative forms of ministry. These, as they soon found, had their own inherent difficulties - those who entered team ministries, for example, faced all of the problems involved in functioning well as a team together, while also trying to

---

40 Ibid. p.314.

41 Ibid. pp.314-15.

be productive in their work. One team ministry that has been remembered as successful is the joint ministry of Jack Penman and Wilf Ford in central Wellington between c.1968 and 1973. This was to result in the establishment of the Inner City Ministry in that area. Over time, however, the Methodist Church has developed some understanding of team ministries; it has done some strategizing to appoint people into such ministries, and it has recognized that these people will need some special care and attention.[42]

During the early 1970s the number of ministers left without parish appointments continued to increase, from 25 in 1970 to 45 by 1975. Much of this increase seems to have been due to the big rise in the numbers permitted to engage in some full-time or part-time trade, business or profession - only 2 ministers in 1970 but 19 by 1975.[43]

An example of one of those who entered full-time secular employment around this time was Owen Kitchingham, the man who pioneered Methodist work in industrial chaplaincy between 1966 and 1974. Finding chaplaincy work too limiting, as it left him an observor of industrial life rather than a direct participant, Kitchingham successfully applied for a job as Personnel Officer with the Christchurch Drainage Board in 1974. Here he was able to find what he desired - acceptance both as a worker and as a minister of the Church. In 1980 Kitchingham was to go on to become

---

42 Conversation with Dave Mullan, December 1989.

43 See Table 2.

lecturer in Management Studies at the Christchurch Polytechnic.[44]

That such numbers are visible at all is due to the gradual improvement in the status of such ministers during these years. The question as to who had been given permission to engage in "any trade, business, or profession" was first included in the Minutes of the 1969 Annual Conference. It was retained as part of a new classification two years later when the Faith and Order and Law Revision Committees revised the section of the Law Book referring to ministers without appointment. This meant that such ministers were no longer hidden in the Journal of Conference. Their existence was acknowledged by the Church, and they were even included in the list of stations. The revisions of 1971 said nothing about the reduction of their status to that of lay preachers although, unlike all other ministers without appointment (except for married women ministers) they were still not to be members of Conference. All ministers wanting to be without appointment still had to make an annual application. Those who had been given permission to engage in a trade, business or profession for five years in succession, however, were then required to make the choice between either resigning from the ministry, or giving up their work and, if they could prove they had "no disqualification of character nor any pecuniary embarrassment", re-entering the ministry.[45]

---

44 MAC, 1980, pp.430-31.

In 1974 the Committee on Ministry suggested removing the either/or nature of this latter question. It was in favour of the five-yearly review, but thought that there was "no reason why a person may not continue in this status for a longer period." It did propose, however, a number of responsibilities such ministers should be prepared to keep if they were to "retain the designation of a minister". These included, for example, meeting with other ministers to evaluate their work; attending the ministerial synod; and conducting some worship. If ministers did not acknowledge these obligations, then, said the Committee, "for all practical purposes [they] are no longer regarded as 'Methodist Ministers', they should not regard themselves as such, nor use the title 'Reverend", nor be listed in the minutes."[46] Thus, although the status of ministers who had entered into business was improved during the 1970s, the Church was still keen to ensure they knew that there were obligations to be kept if they were to retain that status. Ultimately, though, that status was still limited by the fact that such ministers did not have the right to membership within the Conference.

By the mid-1970s, then, various suggestions as to alternative forms of ordained ministry had been made and, on a somewhat piecemeal basis, were being implemented. In 1976, however, "the door was suddenly opened" much wider to allow the introduction of a new, non-stipendiary form of

---

45 Ibid. 1971, pp.320-22.

46 Ibid. 1974, pp.77-8.

ministry.[47] There were two main reasons for this development. It was the result, firstly, of the Church finally recognising that its financial problems did make radical change necessary if it was to retain anything like the level of ministerial presence it now enjoyed. And it came, secondly, as a part of that process of change that had been occurring in the Church's concepts of ministry, a process admitting a growing flexibility and diversity to its forms of ordained ministry.

These factors were both expressed in important reports of 1975-6, already referred to in Chapter One. The 1975 report from the Faith and Order Committee once again set before the Conference the Church's financial difficulties. The Church, it suggested, was discovering that it could no longer afford to pay for a large full-time ministry - "proportionally fewer...[could]...be supported by existing financial provisions." At the moment resources were being impoverished and the ministry "sometimes embarrassed and thus inhibited." The Committee saw the solution to this problem lying in the releasing of lay energy. There were, it believed, those who were willing to serve - a "natural leadership within the church" - but whose energy had remained largely untapped because of an over-concentration on the ordained. They were there though, waiting to be released, "waiting for the encouragement of further opportunities of service." As already noted, the

---

47 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.75.

Committee suggested that one such opportunity would lie in the creation of a diaconate. Another, it believed, could be found within the presbyterate if certain of its conditions of employment - specifically income and itinerancy - were made more flexible. Presbyters could be allowed to receive less than the minimum stipend and allowances; to stand in varying relationships to provisions for housing, retirement and allied funds; and to exercise their ministry within one localised setting.[48]

Such ideas were also being addressed in a similar way by the Committee on Ministry. In the same year it reported that, in conjunction with the Auckland Diocese of the Anglican Church, it was exploring the development of a "community ministry" - "a ministry trained, ordained, unpaid." Anglican initiatives here had quite an influence on Methodist thought. Its "Community Ministry" (later to become the "Auxiliary Ministry") was well-established in the 1970s. The idea of the community ministry seemed to be picking up what the special committee of 1970 had acknowledged as important - the need for new forms of ministry in a changing world - as it envisaged a role in meeting the demands of "mushrooming new suburbs in our major cities."[49]

As already noted, these reports were received by Conference and fed into the Faith and Order Committee's 1976

---

48 MAC, 1975, pp.255-6.

49 Ibid. pp.56-7.

report on "Diversity in Ministry". In this the Committee stated that it believed the time was right to receive, train and ordain those who had a call to ministry, but who did not wish to enter the "professional" or paid work. So it suggested the creation of a "non-stipendiary, ordained ministry which would stand alongside the parish-based Church-paid ministry." It envisaged that candidates for this new form of ministry would normally be "mature persons" currently engaged in effective ministry, but wanting to extend it through further training and ordination. They would not necessarily attend the Theological College, for their training would be "tailor-made and field-based". They would be engaged at some "specific cutting edge of the Church's ministry though some may exercise a congregation-centred ministry." They might work, for example, in new housing areas, or small rural areas, or as assistants in city circuits.[50]

In recommending this new form of ministry the Committee set out those influences that, in recent years, had brought it to this point. These echoed the thinking of the previous year and so again mixed practical needs with theological reflection. Thus the Committee reminded the Church of the financial pressures felt by local parishes, that might easily result in them being unable to afford to keep their ministers. A non-stipendiary presbyterate offered those churches new ways of retaining an ordained

---

50 Ibid. 1976, pp.266-7.

presence. It also acknowledged the new ministry as a further expression of a changing theology of ministry. As has been shown the Church's understanding of the nature of ordained ministry had, since the 1950s, gradually been becoming more flexible. As the Committee pointed out, the realisation had grown that, although given a variety of functions, including pastoral, liturgical and teaching responsibilities, the presbyterate could not be restricted "simply in terms of these specific functions." So the Church had come to accept and appreciate a growing diversity, both within its own ordained ministry and within that of other Churches. The increase in chaplaincies, for example had, according to the Committee, helped it "to see the value of a specifically Christian and ordained presence within some of the key organisations and sectors of...society." It had become familiar with movements such as the Worker Priests of Europe and "spoken of the value of a tent-making ministry." It was also aware of the Anglican Church's Auxiliary Ministry and knew that some Methodists were interested in this kind of opportunity. It had even come to allow many of its own ordained ministers to earn their living in other occupations while (for the most part) retaining their ministerial relationships to the Conference. The introduction of a non-stipendiary presbyterate would thus be one more expression of the long-term diversification of the ordained Methodist ministry.[51]

---

51 Ibid.

The Committee's recommendation was passed by the 1976 Conference, along with its proposal for a new diaconate, to which the non-stipendiary option would also apply. In 1978 Fa'aoso Tugia, Ala'ivae Aiolupo, Tanielu T. Sa'o and Tuuau Tiata became the first candidates to be accepted for training as self-supporting presbyters. By 1980 there were 7 ministers and probationers (2.2% of the total) and 9 students (30%) within the Church's non-stipendiary ministry. In 1987 these numbers had risen to 21 ministers and probationers (6.5% of the total) and 7 students (36.8%).[52]

The introduction of the self-supporting ministry (both diaconal and presbyteral) has been very significant in the development of the Methodist ministry in New Zealand. It has sought to tap a pool of local lay talent and so it has been firmly rooted within the setting of the local parish. This has meant changes to the selection, training and deployment of candidates, and some of these issues (as they pertain to the presbyteral ministry) will be examined in later chapters. Two central things would emerge however. The place of local congregations in all of these activities would be revived and enhanced, helping them to recover some of their own initiative and responsibility; and access "to sacramental ministry of ordained people was now [in theory at least] widely extended throughout the Connexion."[53]

---

52 Ibid. 1980, pp.14-27.
Ibid. 1987, pp.20-38.

53 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.76.

CHAPTER 3

AN INCLUSIVE MINISTRY

Between 1880 and 1980 the Methodist Church in New Zealand was involved in various debates over certain of its restrictions upon those who could enter and fully take part in its ordained ministry. These restrictions were based on gender, race and marital status. Their eventual removal has resulted in some far-reaching changes as the composition of the ordained Methodist ministry has been gradually widened.

Women in ordained ministry

In 1880 the ordained ministry of the New Zealand Methodist Church, following the long traditions of other denominations, was open only to men. The first woman to enter the Methodist presbyterate was not accepted for training until 1953. It has been argued that the long delay before women were included in the sacramental ministry was due "as much to social influences as to religious considerations."[1] That is, that society's view of women and their place was just as important in denying women access to ordination as any theological reflections about the nature of ordained ministry. One question to be kept in mind here, then, is how much the Church's eventual decision to grant that access was due to changes within society, and how much was due to changes in theology.

---

1 Fry, p.218.

When the Methodist Church began in the eighteenth century no special qualifications were required of those wishing to enter the ministry that would have excluded women. However, as the organisation of the Church took shape and a more professional pastorate developed, custom ensured that women were not called for ordination.[2]

The new connexion did, however, allow women to become local preachers. Wesley himself moved from a position of giving private and cautious encouragement to certain women preachers (advising Sarah Crosby in 1769, for example, to keep to "short exhortations" rather than "what is called preaching") to a more open tolerance of their activities.[3] Thus he said: "God owns women in the conversion of sinners, and who am I that I should withstand God?"[4] The work women were doing was so good that Wesley was obliged to accept them. So, for some time after his death a number of women preachers remained active within Methodism. In 1835, however, the Wesleyan Conference expressed its strong disapproval of "female preaching", and, from this time onwards, it was both discouraged and deprecated within that connexion. It was left to the newer, more radical connexions to continue the tradition, and women preachers remained a noticeable feature within the work of

---

2 Ibid. p.209.

3 Church, p.137, 139.

4 John Wesley, quoted by Fry, p.211.

both the Primitive Methodists and the Bible Christians for some years to come.[5]

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries women were involved in various areas of Methodist work in New Zealand.

The Wesleyan Church retained its reservations about women preaching and reflected these in church law. The 1885 Law Book stated that it was "of the opinion that, in general, women ought not to preach." It gave two reasons for this, neither making appeal to any kind of theological base. It argued, firstly, that a "vast majority" of Methodists were opposed to it, and, secondly, that it did not seem necessary that women should preach. However the law, like John Wesley, was prepared to make exceptions, and for the same reason: provided that a woman "think she has an extraordinary call of God in public (and we are sure it must be an extraordinary call that can authorise it)." Once again Methodists were affirming that the call of God should not be withstood. Even with this call, however, women preachers still faced certain limitations. They should, for example, address, in general, their own sex alone; and they needed the approbation of their Superintendent Minister and Quarterly Meeting to preach in their own circuit, or a written invitation and recommendatory note to preach in others.[6]

---

5 Church, p.137.

6 Handbook of the Regulations of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Church [hereafter Handbook], 1885, p.83.

In 1888 the New Zealand Annual Conference resolved to ask the General Conference of the Australasian Connexion (the body, of which it was a part until 1910, through which all of its legislative reform passed)[7] to reconsider this law. Why, or in what direction, it did not say.[8] No mention of the recommendation has been found in the Minutes of the General Conference, but the law had disappeared by the time the new Law Book of 1895 was produced.

Thus The Wesleyan Church's restrictions on women becoming local preachers seem to have been lifted. An early example of a successful woman preacher was Joan Scott, who came to live in New Zealand in her mid-life in 1863, and who preached well into her seventies. She travelled the country, on foot and horseback, conducting missions in fifty different circuits. One in Wanganui, for example, resulted in "fifty souls being led to the Saviour." It was said of Scott that, "though not allowed the honour of being Conference evangelist, she is certainly God's evangelist."[9] Unfortunately there is no easy way of establishing just how many women became Methodist local preachers, as the records of the Local Preachers' Association were destroyed by fire in the 1950s.

As already noted, another field of service opened up for Methodist women at the end of the nineteenth century.

---

7 Anderson, p.19.

8 MAC, 1888, p.67.

9 Fry, pp.209-10.

The British Wesleyan Deaconess Order was founded in 1887, and, not long after, deaconesses were being employed in New Zealand. The Order began here on an unofficial basis, but in 1897 the Annual Conference recommended "that where women are formally engaged by the Church who devote themselves entirely to Christian work, they shall be known as Deaconesses."[10] (The Presbyterians were making similar moves in New Zealand around this time. Their first deaconess, Sister Christabel, came to Dunedin to begin the work in 1901, and their Order was officially recognised at the General Assembly of 1903.[11]) The Methodist training institution, Deaconess House, was opened in Christchurch in 1908, and in 1912 the Order was given status in the eyes of the Church when its members were listed in the Minutes of Conference.[12]

Methodist deaconesses could give professional, qualified service in a particular field. Sisters Lizzie Belton and Alice Bowman were, for example, trained nurses who worked with the Dunedin Central Mission at the beginning of the twentieth century. They could also work in social service or pastoral ministry of a more general character. Sister Margaret Nicholls, for example, was one who worked with Maori in the Waikato and King Country from the 1920s.[13]

---

10 MAC, 1897, p.64.

11 J.D. Salmond, By Love Serve, Christchurch, Presbyterian Bookroom, 1963, pp.10-14.

12 Hames, Out of the Common Way, pp.124-5.

13 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.26.

There were too some isolated instances of deaconesses being appointed to the work of the ordained. A first step was taken in 1907 when Sister Moody Bell became the first woman to take charge of a Home Mission Circuit in Australasia. She worked in Kumara, on the West Coast, until around 1909, with - according to the religious press - the "eyes of Israel, from Dan to Beersheba" upon her. This appointment, however, was considered by the Church to be "a daring irregularity to meet a desperate need", and the experiment was not repeated for another twenty years.[14] In 1928, though, Sister Rita Snowden was appointed supply minister to Raetihi, where she fulfilled all the functions of one ordained except for administering the sacraments; and in 1936 Sister Edith Beer was appointed to the Upper Hutt circuit.

Methodist women were also involved in a number of other activities within the life of the Church. Some worked in the Methodist Women's Missionary Auxiliaries, supporting the work of home and foreign missions; like, for example, Mary Bowron, who held office in the Christchurch Auxiliary for twenty-five years and became the national Methodist Women's Missionary Union's first President in 1915.[15] Some belonged to Ladies Guilds, doing a variety of local church work, which often included providing parsonage furniture and raising money to build churches and pay off church debts.[16]

---

14 Fry, pp.210-11.

15 Ibid. pp.115-16.

Some worked in social services (in residential homes, for example, like May Hunter, who was Matron of the Alexandra Home in the late 1920s),[17] and some for social reform (like, for example, Annie Schnackenberg, who was President of the Women's Christian Temperance Union between 1891 and 1900).[18] Some also were part of the very strong Methodist Young Women's Bible Class Union (YWBCU), established on a national basis in 1906 (like, for example, the Union's second travelling secretary, Lorna Hodder, who was the recipient of this somewhat arch comment in the Methodist Times after being appointed to the Stationing Committee - "Watch out, Lorna, lest you become the first ordained woman minister and if so, could you be denied the President's chair and gown?")[19]

Methodist women were, thus, active as local preachers, as deaconesses, and as workers in the mission field, in local churches, in social services and reform, and with youth. To some extent their very devotion to these tasks may be seen as helping to divert attention "from their exclusion from wider leadership and ministry."[20] However, "the fact that there were already able women...taking responsibility for important areas of the Church's work"

---

16 Ibid. p.120.

17 Ibid. p.168.

18 Ibid. p.154.

19 NZMT, 1939, March 25, p.386.

20 Fry, p.211.

also played a very great part in preparing the ground for the ordination of women that was to come.[21]

In the late 1930s the Methodist Church began to debate the question of the ordination of women. This debate took place within the wider context of a "radical change in the place of women in society."[22] The turn of the century had seen the removal of "the most blatant forms of legal discrimination" against women in New Zealand with, for example, the granting of the franchise in 1893, and the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act in 1901. In the 1880s women began to enter secondary schools and universities, winning the right to enter the medical and legal professions in the 1890s. Women also found jobs as teachers and nurses, in the clerical sector, and in factories.[23] The Second World War would see even more women entering the work-force and taking up jobs formerly a male preserve. Increasing proportions of these would be middle-aged, married women re-entering employment.[24] There was still a long way to go on the road to greater social and economic equality, but these were to be very important changes.

The Church's debate arose more directly out of the work of various committees set up during this time to

---

21 Ibid. p.213.

22 Kathleen Bliss, The Service and Status of Women in the Churches, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952, p.132.

23 Erik Olssen, "Towards a New Society", in W.H. Oliver & B.R. Williams (eds.), The Oxford History of New Zealand, Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1981, pp.259-60

24 Graeme Dunstall, "The Social Pattern", in Oliver & Williams, p.427.

examine the role of women within its ministry. Three things may be noted throughout these discussions. Firstly, the ordination of women was, for some within the Church, bound up with questions they wanted to ask about the future of the Deaconess Order. Concerns were repeatedly expressed which suggest that all was not perceived to be well with the Order. Secondly, only a little by way of theological discussion - either for or against the ordination of women - survives in the reports the committees presented to the Church. This does not necessarily mean that such discussion did not occur, but, if it did, it does not seem to have been considered significant enough to record. Thirdly, as Margaret Reid Martin observes, the decision to ordain women was one that was made, in both the Methodist and the Presbyterian Church, primarily by men - "no woman has stood out to 'fight' for the ordination of women." She suggests that this may have been because the acceptance of the decision, in both churches, was "generally...very smooth.".[25]

In 1939 a notice of motion that women be admitted into the ordained Methodist ministry was moved at Conference by Charlie Hailwood. The Conference responded by referring the question to the Board of Studies, with "certain corresponding lady members"[26], with a view to exploring the possibilities of "an Ordained Order of Women on the lines

---

25 Margaret Reid Martin, "A Personal Reflection and Vision", in Enid Bennett (ed.), With Heads Uncovered, Auckland, The Women in Ministry Network, 1988, p.21.

26 NZMT, 1939, March 11, p.367.

adopted by the Methodist Church of Great Britain."[27] The following year the Board reported mixed reactions from its corresponding members. Of four replies received, two were enthusiastically in favour of the appointment of women as ministers, while the others thought that it would be better to improve the training and status of the Deaconess Order. The Board itself could see "no insuperable difficulty" in training women candidates for the ministry at the Theological College "if that were desired". After conceding this, however, it went on to say that it felt the question to be so important and urgent that it needed consideration in every aspect by a large, representative committee of ministers, laymen and women. The report ended by resolving that no action be taken at present.[28]

In 1941, however, the question was raised again, this time by Lorna Hodder on behalf of the Young Women's Bible Class Convention. The young women, reported the Methodist Times,

> ...were anxious that the doors of service be opened to the young women of the Church. They claimed the training of our deaconesses was so elementary, there was no security of employment, and an inadequate stipend, and therefore there was a lack of appeal to the educated women of our Church.

The YWBCU wanted to see committees investigating both the whole matter of deaconess training and service, and the question of admitting women into the ordained ministry.[29]

---

27 MAC, 1939, p.168.

28 Ibid. 1940, pp.175-6.

29 NZMT, 1941, March 8, p.364.

These committees were established and their report to the 1942 Conference favoured the ordination of women, producing this rather strong statement:

> In the reconstructive programme of the Church in this age, the Committee regards as important the responsibility of women to share equally with men the task of leadership in Christian thought and action. The Church needs, therefore, to make an appropriate and adequate place for suitable women in its ordained ministry.[30]

The Methodist Church, however, was not yet ready for quite such a statement and, according to one woman at the Conference, it was given a "very poor reception".[31] This section was dropped from the final form of the report and replaced with yet another recommendation that the question be referred on to a special commission.[32]

The Commission on Women and the Ordained Ministry, thus established in 1942, had problems meeting however. All sorts of delays were caused by the Second World War and the removal of its Convenor from Auckland, and then by the need to revise its membership after a break of four years. Finally, however, this delay was seen as being a good thing, for in 1945 a committee of the British Methodist Conference had produced a "valuable report and series of recommendations" on the question of the ordination of women.[33] In 1946 the British Conference was to pass a

---

30 Journal, 1942, (no page number available here).

31 V. Smith, "Conference from a Woman's Point of View", in NZMT, 1942, March 21, p.385.

32 MAC, 1942, p.146.

33 Ibid. 1946, p.190.

resolution suggesting the enlargement of the sphere of service of deaconesses and women missionaries overseas, so that those who attained the standard required for ordination should receive presbyters' orders to administer the Sacraments as well as preach the Word.[34] It was thought that these developments would assist the New Zealand committee in its work. As Fry points out: "New Zealand was not in any way bound to follow the Mother Country; on the other hand, with a reputation for progressive social measures, she did not want to be seen to lag behind."[35]

The Commission, then, was reconstituted in 1946, and presented its first report to the Conference of the following year. Believing "that there are spheres of service for women in the ordained ranks" it repeated the invitation to the Church to "declare its readiness to accept women into the Ordained Ministry."[36] The Church, though, was still not ready to do so; not enough time was left at Conference for the issue to be properly looked at, and so, once again, any decision was put off for another year.[37] It was not until 1948, then, that the Methodist Church of New Zealand finally resolved to open its ordained ministry to women.[38]

---

34 Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Church (Great Britain), 1946, p.57.

35 Fry, p.212.

36 MAC, 1947, p.168.

37 NZMT, 1947, March 29, p.369.

38 MAC, 1948, p.169.

It had taken the Church nearly ten years of debate and procrastination to decide in favour of Hailwood's original motion. It is difficult to be sure of the level of actual, open opposition within the Methodist Church to allowing women into the ordained ministry, or of how influential this was. Such opposition was not widely expressed in, for example, reports or resolutions to Conference, or articles or letters to the Methodist Times. The experience of the first woman to be accepted for training, however, indicates that opposition did exist. Phyllis Guthardt, a twenty-three year old teaching in Christchurch, faced opposition from her Circuit Superintendent when she made known her intention to candidate. He believed that wherever the ordination of women had been tried it had been a "washout", and that, if women were called in, men would slip out of the ministry altogether. His attitude forced Guthardt to make her application through the Nelson Synod, where, luckily, she still held membership.[39] It is also true to say, however, that, in trying to make its decision over these ten years, the Church would have much preferred to be dealing with a concrete case, rather than just "debating it year after year in a theoretical fashion." As E.T. Olds remarked, in his Presidential address of 1948, "The coming forward of a young woman as a candidate would undoubtedly help us come to a decision."[40]

---

39 Fry, p.214.

The Methodist Church made its decision to admit women into its ordained ministry in the face of nineteen centuries of church tradition and well before the other main denominations in New Zealand - the Congregationalists were to accept an ordained woman minister from Scotland in 1951, but the Presbyterians were not to ordain a woman until 1965, nor the Anglicans until 1977. For all of the delays, then, the Methodist decision was still a brave one, and it was felt at the time that it was being made with some risk to the Church. However, it was also made with the feeling that, as Charlie Hailwood reflected on the acceptance of Guthardt in 1953, even if problems did eventuate "yet the Church still did the right thing...."[41]

With the decision to admit women into its ordained ministry thus made, the Church had now to decide what kind of a ministry this would be.

The Conference made an important statement in 1948 when it agreed that the selection - or "standards of acceptance" - and training - the basic curriculum at Trinity - of women seeking to enter the ministry should be the same as it was for men. In these respects, then, there was to be equality. However, it was also resolved that, for women, the main avenue of approach into the ministry should be through the Deaconess Order.[42]

---

40 NZMT, 1948, February 14, p.313.

41 Ibid. 1953, November 28, p.486.

42 MAC, 1948, p.169.

The main reason for this latter was contained within the Commission's report of the previous year. Most of its members had felt that the question of women and the ministry was inseparable from a thorough consideration and revision of the whole system of deaconess training. They wanted the status of the Order "greatly enhanced". Making it a stepping-stone to ordained ministry was just such an opportunity. One of the Commission's corresponding members had opposed this view, declaring "the day of Deaconesses is over". She saw the question of women and the ministry as a much larger one - one that "must be faced squarely and courageously as a paramount issue involving the whole organisation and set-up of the wider Ministry."[43] Whether or not this was the motive, it did not become a requirement that women approach the ordained ministry through the Deaconess Order. As already noted, a number of deaconesses did eventually enter the presbyterate, but this was really to do with the nature of the ministry they were already exercising.

In 1949 the Commission produced another report, setting out more of its ideas as to the kind of ministry it envisaged for ordained women. This was to be a "special", but rather limited, ministry. So the "most favourable avenues of service" for women ministers were seen to be as colleagues in large churches or circuits with two or more ministers. Here they would have "the full right and

---

43 Ibid. 1947, p.168.

opportunity to exercise a normal Pulpit Ministry and Pastorate", while giving, however, "special attention to women's activities and the more intimate aspects of the Pastoral Office to women." The report foresaw that women offering for ministry would be of "outstanding capacity" in some special field, and so suggested that special areas of service, like for example, City Missions, should be found where those gifts could be exercised.[44]

One particular problem the Church found itself facing as it thought about the ministry of women was "the effect of marriage". This had been indicated as early as 1948 as a 'practical issue' needing to be investigated,[45] and - according to Hailwood - "the most common question asked" during Guthardt's candidature had been, "What if she decides to get married?"[46]

A special committee was set up in 1956 to consider the question, but it was not until 1959 that any decisions were made. The committee's recommendation was that "normally a woman Minister who marries should be left without an appointment." This was based on the assertion that a minister is ordained for life - for "a continued full-time service" - and that, for a woman, "marriage could make difficult if not impossible such full-time service." The married woman minister would have a duty to her home and

---

44 Ibid. 1949, p.155.

45 Ibid. 1948, p.169.

46 NZMT, 1953, November 28, p.486.

children which would inevitably conflict with her duty to the Church. She should, thus, relinquish her ministry and be left without appointment.[47]

Besides being based on a very inflexible view of ordination - that it involves full-time service only - this argument rested upon a rigid and stereotyped view of a woman's "place" - that is, that only she can be a "nurturer" in the home, and that her role as wife and mother comes before all else she does. The committee acknowledged that "a wife's position in her home is not parallel to that of a husband", but it did not question whether or not this should be so. Instead it accepted it as a given.[48]

In its first report to Conference the committee suggested that a woman minister who married should be treated in the same way as a minister who resigned. So she would lose her status as an ordained minister and be considered as an accredited local preacher only. Her name would not appear in the printed Minutes of Conference, only in its Journal. She would have the right to attend Synod, but not to be a member of Conference unless elected as a lay representative. Finally, if she wanted to be reinstated to the active work she would have to satisfy (with a two-thirds vote in her favour from each) both the General Purposes Committee and Conference "as to her character and ability to give full-time service to the Church."[49]

---

47 MAC, 1959, pp.221-2.

48 Ibid. p.222.

These provisions, however, were not passed by the Conference. There was a feeling, expressed in Church Council, that the Church should be very careful in taking away the privileges of ordination.[50] So it was decided that, instead, the married woman minister should be given the status of a minister without pastoral charge. If seeking reinstatement she would still need a two-thirds vote in her favour, but would no longer have to prove her character.[51] However, although thus modified, the intention of the original report still remained - Methodist women ministers were to be single.

It is difficult to be sure just how many times this law was used, but it was made to apply at least once in the early 1960s, when one of the female students at Trinity became engaged to a fellow student, and was told by the Principal that her position at the College had now become "somewhat anomalous". He suggested that she resign and so she did.[52] The law remained in the Law Book until at least 1971, but had vanished from the next edition of 1981. No trace has so far been found of the details of its going.

The early 1960s also saw the Church engaging in further reflections on the nature of the ministry of women, reflections which reveal the kind of thinking it was doing about the nature of ministry in general at this time.

---

49 Journal, 1959, (no page number available here).

50 MAC, 1959, p.75.

51 Ibid. p.223.

52 Interview with Lois Clarke, 18 August, 1988.

In 1962 Conference resolved that a committee be appointed "to investigate the question of the Ministry of Women", considering in particular the nature of that ministry, the ordination of women, and implications for training.[53] In the following year this Commission on the Ministry of Women reported that, in the course of its discussion, several points had emerged. It began by affirming what had been done so far, stating that "the decision of the Church to admit women into the ordained Ministry of the Word and Sacraments is not under question". It admitted, however, that there was a need to think about, and experiment with, the forms that this ministry should take. Its suggestion was that the ministry of women should be quite different from that of men. It should be:

> ...a ministry <u>of women</u>, developing and using the distinctive gifts and qualities of women. It should not be a replica of the ministry of men. The Church could be greatly enriched by such a ministry.[54]

The Commission believed the different gifts and different ways of working that women brought to ministry were to be valued and made use of, for these differences were the very things that would enrich the ministry of the whole Church. In its opinion, the whole concept of ministry, in both lay and ministerial orders, and for both women and men, needed "to be expanded to make better use of varying gifts."[55] Differences were to be acknowledged and

---

53 <u>MAC</u>, 1962, p.260.

54 <u>Ibid.</u> 1963, p.241.

55 <u>Ibid.</u> 1964, p.212.

valued; the Church should not pretend they did not exist, or use them as an excuse for inequality. The ministry of women, finally a reality, was to be a unique and equal ministry of women.

The marriage of candidates and probationers

In the 1880s those entering the ordained Methodist ministry were expected to be unmarried. According to the 1885 Law Book, "unmarried men alone" were, as a general rule, received as Preachers on Trial, and, once on trial, were "not at liberty to marry during their probation."[56]

There were three main reasons why the Church wanted its ministers-in-training to be single. Firstly, and of the most immediate importance, it could not afford to keep married students and their families while they were in training.[57] During this early period students were expected to contribute towards the cost of training. They received no financial help from the Church, in the form of allowances, until 1896. Set at £2 a quarter these were certainly not enough for a family to live on. So, where the Church did make exceptions and allow married candidates it demanded that Conference be satisfied of the couples' ability to meet their financial obligations. Thus they were required to show an account of their income, signed by their Superintendent.[58]

---

56 Handbook, 1885, pp.36-7.

57 Hames, Coming of Age, p.105.

58 Handbook, 1885, pp.36-7, 197.

Secondly, the Church retained a puritanical belief that students should be single and free from distraction while preparing for ministry. It was an old theory that men did not study after they were married. "Presumably", said Eric Hames, "they were so busy washing up or rocking the baby that they could not keep their minds on their books."[59] Methodism also had the heritage of a certain mistrust of marriage and a desire to exercise some overall control over the marriages of its ministers. John Wesley was one who congratulated young men on their 'deliverance' from marriage; and told cautionary tales of preachers who had married against his advice "and were either 'dead within the twelvemonth' or suffered some hardly less signal token of divine disapproval." He was also willing to demote preachers if he didn't find their wives acceptable.[60] The New Zealand Wesleyan Church reflected this mistrust, stating in its 1885 Law Book that no steps were "to be taken towards matrimony by any Preacher without consultation with his brethren and especially his Superintendent." If the Chairman of a District had reason to believe that any minister had not "complied with the Apostolic injunction to 'marry in the Lord'" he should report the case to Conference.[61] No evidence has been found of these laws

---

59 Hames, Coming of Age, p.105.

60 Ayling, pp.293-4.

61 Handbook, p.40.

being used against a minister, but they lasted until the Law Books of 1908 and 1951 respectively.

Finally, the Church's desire for single students was set within the context of a society in which marriage tended to occur later in life. Many candidates for ministry were accepted for training at a comparatively early age (often in their twenties), while the general West European pattern was of marriage at a late age with a high proportion of people never marrying.[62] In this way, then, the Church was a mirror for society.

The expectation that those entering the Methodist ministry would be unmarried lasted well into the twentieth century. Some fifty years later, for example, the new Law Book of 1933 was still asserting that no probationer should marry except by permission of the Conference. It would give its permission to those who applied in writing, stating their "special circumstances", and showing that they could support themselves and their dependents during the term of their probation.[63] A typical such application was made in 1946 by a twenty-nine year old first-year probationer. It stated that he and his fiancee had been "keeping company" since 1938, but had postponed an earlier marriage so that he could take the full College course; and included details of his bank account and a small insurance policy.[64]

---

62 Dunstall, p.400.

63 Laws and Regulations of the Methodist Church of New Zealand [hereafter, and for all years following, Laws and Regulations], 1933, (on the page opposite p.20.)

64 Journal, 1946, (no page number available here).

At this stage, however, the Church was still not happy granting such permission, and in 1935 tried to restrict the numbers of married probationers "except in very exceptional cases." This, it said, was in view of the difficulties experienced in their stationing; the misunderstandings in circuits concerning their status; and their financial embarrassments after marriage.[65]

The 1940s, however, saw the Church moving, and being moved, in two opposing directions. On the one hand it acted to make it more difficult for both married and older candidates to be accepted for training. So the 1942 Report of the Commission on Ministerial Training contained a recommendation requiring that candidates who were married or aged twenty-five years and over receive at least two-thirds of the votes of the Examination Committee and Conference, instead of the usual simple majority.[66] On the other hand, however, the Church was being obliged to think seriously about having to accept married candidates. Two things were combining to cause this.

Firstly, the Church was forced to look closely at its staffing needs as a result of the Second World War. It had, it considered, sustained "heavy losses" with the withdrawal of younger ministers to serve as chaplains with the Armed Forces, and it faced a possible shortage of

---

64 Journal, 1946, (no page number available here).

65 MAC, 1935, p.155.

66 Ibid. 1942, p.32.

ministers after the war.[67] The number of ministers and probationers in connexion with the Church had in fact increased by only 0.89% during the war, from 226 in 1940 to 228 in 1945.[68] The Church began to express its concern as early as 1941. In that year economies were suggested in the use of ministers for Departmental or Connexional offices, so as to make them available for circuit work.[69] In 1943 all circuit ministers and officials were urged to "seek out and give every encouragement to suitable young men to offer for...[the]...work" by, for example, the observance of a College Sunday.[70] And in 1944 Conference gave its approval to "suitable emergency arrangements" being made during the actual selection of candidates in order to facilitate the candidature of men returning from the Forces.[71] This was applied to those coming back from Defaulters' Camps in the following year.[72]

Secondly, the social context the Church was working in began to change. The post-war years saw not only a short-term increase in the number of marriages - as those delayed by war were now celebrated - but also a fundamental change to the very pattern of marriage. The centuries-old

---

67 Ibid. 1941, p.159.

68 See Table 4.

69 MAC, 1941, p.159.

70 Ibid. 1943, p.33.

71 Ibid. 1944, p.35.

72 Ibid. 1945, p.33.

West European pattern of late marriage came to an end, and marriage generally in New Zealand society "became virtually universal and occurred at an earlier age." The results of the increasing nuptiality of the late 1940s and 1950s can be seen in the so-called "baby boom", by which the New Zealand birth rate rose from a low of just over 16 per 1000 in 1935-6 to over 26 per 1000 by the late 1940s, a level which was maintained until 1961.[73]

The Church from the 1940s, then, was confronted with a dilemma. It desperately needed more ministers, but its candidates were much more likely to be, or want to be, married and married young. Social reality had changed and the Church would have to change to meet it.

A cautious beginning was made in 1943, when the Home Mission and Church Extension Department proposed the introduction of student pastorates. The Department reasoned that "in view of the fitness of some of the men concerned, and of the needs of the Church, married men should not be debarred from offering themselves as candidates." So it suggested that when accepted candidates were married, if possible, suitable supply appointments should be found for them in Auckland, from where they could pursue a course of study as non-resident students at the Theological College.[74] These pastorates would, thus, help to overcome the financial

---

73 Dunstall, p.400.

74 MAC, 1943, p.120.

difficulties facing married students by providing them with a source of income.

The first married student pastor, Harry Moore, was appointed to the Glen Eden church in 1943. In the following year the College's Acting-Principal, Eric Hames, reported that the experiment "has proved an unqualified success."[75] The Board of Studies, though, had some reservations. Its members did not consider the plan to be an adequate substitute for three years training and residence in the Theological Institution. For the Board, residence was important. It regarded the new idea as "an emergency provision to meet special cases", and stated that it would "deplore any tendency to make this an alternative route into the ministry, by which young men might be encouraged to marry before becoming Candidates." With these qualifications, however, the Board was still prepared to support student pastorates and to recommend them for the approval of Synods.[76]

Student pastorates thus became a way of enabling married students to train at Trinity. Appointments were usually made to one of the smaller churches in an Auckland circuit, and students travelled into the College daily. Numbers were not large but still significant.

Despite this change, though, there was still a feeling within the Church that the most important thing -

---

75 Ibid. 1944, p.100.

76 Ibid. p.101.

the "matter of first priority" - was to get a "steady supply of young single men of character and ability who can take the full course and prepare for a lifetime of service."[77] This was evident again when the question of providing financial assistance for married students was raised in 1957. In that year the Board of Studies was asked by Conference to bring down proposals for a Ministerial Training Scheme which would enable married men, older candidates and special cases to receive training while still supporting their families.[78] However, the Board did not support such a scheme. Its arguments reflected those, already noted, of the Church in the late nineteenth century. In its opinion, the "normal procedure" was that candidates "should be young and single in order that they may give undivided loyalty and attention to training." Exceptions could be made and married men allowed to train - doing either the full College and probationary course if younger, or a modified version if older - but the Church could not pay for them to do so. Student pastorates would still be available, but it should be remembered that these were "strictly limited in number." In view of "the high cost of finding accommodation and living for married men" the new proposal was not believed to be justified.[79] The Church did

---

77 Ibid. 1950, p.98.

78 Ibid. 1957, p.36.

79 Ibid. 1958, pp.34-5.

not have, or was not prepared to pay, the money necessary to keep larger numbers of married students.

Even so, the problems posed by a changing society could not be escaped. Although the desperate need for more staffing had eased by the late 1950s - the number of ministers and probationers in connexion with the Church rose by 22.59% from 239 in 1950 to 293 in 1960 [80] - it was still the case that candidates were coming from a society where marriages were occurring at a younger age. The Church was finding that it could not realistically continue to demand that its candidates be single.

In the late 1950s Church Council looked at the "strict regulations" governing the marriage of students and probationers, and remarked that, although they had once served a useful purpose, they were now "somewhat outmoded". It pointed out that "in practice the exceptions have become the rule", noting that between the wars men had frequently been allowed to marry before ordination, while during and after the Second World War generous government allowances had enabled many ex-servicemen to marry while pursuing further educational qualifications. This was not good for discipline and led to inequitable situations among the men themselves. The Council also noted that the British Methodist Conference had recently adopted new regulations allowing students and probationers to marry under certain safeguards and where they were able to support themselves.

---

80 See Table 4.

Thus it resolved the New Zealand Conference follow this lead by giving its approval, in principle, to the marriage of its students and probationers.[81]

In 1959 some of the Church's restrictions were eased. Students were now required to spend at least one year of their College course in residence; after that time however, and still only if they were able to support a spouse, they could apply to the President and the General Purposes Committee if they wished to marry and live out. They could make no claim for maintenance or child allowances. Probationers were now "free to marry any time after ...[their]...reception on Probation." The principle of the requirement that candidates who were already married be accepted by a two-thirds vote was, however, kept in place, Church Council still maintaining that "such cases should be regarded as exceptional".[82]

These changes were enough, however, to open the door, and the 1960s saw an increasing flux of married, and often older, students for the ministry.[83] The Church still had to face some practical problems, though, and these were to continue throughout the decade.

In 1960 the College reported that Auckland circuits were now unwilling to accept student pastors who, "in the nature of things", were unable to do justice to the work of

---

81 MAC, 1958, pp.71-3.

82 Ibid. 1959, pp.78-9.

83 Lewis, p.39.

busy pastorates while trying to keep up with their studies. It hoped that its experiments with the new Emergency Course would come to offer another option. The Conference's decision to phase out the Home Missionary Order and ordain most of its members to the presbyterate had created a whole new group of older, often married men requiring training. The Emergency Course was the College's first attempt at an alternative means of training for these men. Instead of insisting that they come to Trinity for a year's full-time, residential course, the College brought groups of them, just twice-yearly, for two-week residential periods of intensive discussion and teaching, which followed six months of directed reading at home.[84] In this way the Theological College moved out beyond the grounds of Trinity. It also avoided a whole new set of financial problems. The first course had been held earlier in the year, and by 1961 Principal Hames was calling it "a most promising contribution" to the problem of training married men unable to afford the usual three-year course - for mature men, he said, "it may well prove a better method in any case."[85]

The "inadequate financial backing" of married students at College continued to cause "embarrassment" to them and the Church throughout the 1960s, however,[86] and the Conference began to accept that it might be necessary for

---

84 MAC, 1960, p.129.

85 Ibid. 1961, p.121.

86 Ibid. 1962, p.127.

additional financial assistance to be made available.[87] So a variety of living-out allowances and grants were suggested during this period. It was only with the uniting of the Methodist and Anglican Theological Colleges in 1973, however, that some more satisfactory arrangements were made. Methodist students were then placed on financial parity with their Anglican counterparts, receiving, like them, free accommodation on or near to the College site, and (if their spouses were not working) an annual allowance of $1,500. It was also allowed that there might need to be "some compensation in cases where the wife's income is inadequate or for loss of income...during vacation periods."[88] This parity continued until 1981 when, due to a static income and an increased number of students, the Methodist allowances had to be lowered.[89]

By the 1980s, then, the Methodist presbyteral ministry had been opened up to accept as candidates, students and probationers those who were married. Young single men were no longer the Church's first priority.

Maori ministry

Although the ordained Methodist ministry has been open to Maori since the mid-nineteenth century, for nearly one hundred years those who entered the presbyterate were not accorded the same standing as their European colleagues.

---

87 Ibid. 1964, p.126.

88 Ibid. 1972, pp.66-7.

89 Ibid. 1980, pp.128-9.

Instead of being received into full connexion, with full ministerial status, they were given the special, but limited status of "Native Ministers". In the mid-1930s the process began that saw the standing of Maori ministers gradually improved. By the 1960s, however, when full status had finally been achieved, Maoris themselves had begun the questioning that would soon see them choosing to move away from the European model of a theologically-trained, ordained and stipendiary presbyterate in favour of their own, more traditionally Maori style of ministry.

The Methodist Church's Maori ministry emerged from the work of the Maori Mission, which began in New Zealand with the first Wesleyan missionaries in 1822. As their work proceeded, the missionaries recruited local Maoris to help them. They were employed as catechists and native teachers and pastors (like, for example, Minarapa Te Atua-ke and Reihana Te Kamo, appointed by John Hobbs and John Bumby at Te Aro in 1839); Maori assistant missionaries (Hoani Ri Tutu was nominated to be the first in 1840); and local preachers (like, for example, Rawiri Waitere, trained and guided by Samuel Ironside).[90] These Maori workers were often the ones to begin Christian observances in various parts of the country (for example, in the Waikato), giving significant official and unofficial leadership amongst their own people.[91] Those who commended themselves were later invited

---

90 George I. Laurenson, Te Hahi Weteriana, Three Half Centuries of the Methodist Maori Missions 1822-1972, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.27, Nos.1-2, 1972), pp.54-5, 58, 65, 80.

to prepare themselves for ministry as "Native Ministers". The first native ministers emerged during the late-1850s as probationers: Hamiora Ngaropi in 1856, for example, Hone Eketane and Hohepa Otene in 1857, and Wiremu Patene and Te Kote Te Rato in 1859.[92]

The Maori ministry was established, then, by the mid-nineteenth century; however, although ordained for a lfetime of service - just like Europeans in ministry - the status of native ministers differed from that of their colleagues in some very important ways. This was expressed, firstly, in the requirements for their selection and training. Maori candidates and probationers were subject to all the ordinary rules as to Synod and Conference trial sermons (and allowed to preach in Maori in "exceptional cases")[93] but the other tests for admission and qualifications demanded of them were said to differ "in degree".[94] The majority were not required to attend the Church's Theological College for training. Instead many were educated at the Three Kings Native Institution (twenty-three between 1845 and 1922),[95] established in Auckland by Walter Lawry for the training of "selected Maori

---

91 Allan K. Davidson, Christianity in Aotearoa, A History of Church and Society in New Zealand, 1989, p.37.

92 Laurenson, p.158, 160, 168.

93 MAC, 1912, p.15.

94 Ibid. 1935, p.28.

95 E.W. Hames, Wesley College, A Centenary Survey, 1844-1944, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.3, No.4 & Vol.4, No.1), p.24.

converts".[96] Others served for a number of years in the home mission field before being received for ordination. Secondly, native ministers were granted only a limited relationship to the legislative bodies of the Church. They were not admitted as members of their District Synods or the Annual Conference until 1919, and then they were still denied the right, given to European ministers, of speaking and voting on matters relating to the reception of European - and, at the District Synod, Maori - candidates for ministry.[97] Finally, Maori ministers were not included in some of the important financial provisions made by the Church for its European ministers. They were not, for example, members of either the Supernumerary or Home Acquirement Funds.

The Church's long-term policy with regard to Maori ministry was expressed in 1917, when Conference resolved that "the end to be aimed at in our policy" was "the amalgamation of the native work with the adjacent European circuits." For this reason it had rejected attempts made in 1897 and 1913 to establish a separate Maori Synod to superintend Maori work. In 1917, however, amalgamation was considered for the present "impracticable", and the first General Superintendent of Maori Missions, T.G. Hammond, was appointed to provide "adequate European supervision...in some other way."[98] This latter comment suggests that

---

96 Laurenson, p.103.

97 MAC, 1919, p.100.

amalgamation was seen, by some at least, as a method of control rather than a way of sharing power. This was the kind of thinking, then, that would provide the broad context for the changes the Church would make from the mid-1930s to slowly improve the standing of its native ministers until they were on more of an equal footing with Europeans.

These changes began in the area of selection and training. In 1935 the Examination Committee suggested that if, during selection, a Maori candidate took the higher tests and showed he possessed the higher qualifications required of European candidates, there would be no objection to him receiving full ministerial status. The Committee saw this as being "a natural development" of the policy - laid down by Conference, it said, and pursued in recent years - of bringing Maori work up to the "full circuit standard recognised in European work." This did not mean, however, that Maori ministers thus received into full status should be appointed to European circuits, for "their services would be required and their gifts would be more suited to Maori and mixed work." The Committee did not have in mind either, however, the building up of the Maori as "a distinct race" (which was the Methodist Church's policy in the Solomons). The Church's policy was amalgamation, not greater separation. "In New Zealand", it said, "both Church and State are irretrievably committed to a policy of the unification of the interests and the life of the European

---

98 Ibid. 1917, p.96.

and the Maori races."[99] This was still the ultimate goal, and central to the Church's thinking about Maori-Pakeha relations.

The first Maori student to be received for the full course of ministerial training, with all of the status of a Pakeha student, was Maharaia Winiata, who entered the Theological College in 1937 and completed the course at the end of 1939. Winiata began his probationary term in the Waikato in 1940, but did not go on to ordination, choosing instead to take up a career in education.[100]

Changes were also made to the financial provisions accorded Maori ministers, with the introduction of adequate superannuation seen by the Maori Mission as a "burning question". The Mission was particularly concerned that justice be done for Maori ministers "who have in some cases, served for upwards of 40 years without any provision for their old age."[101] When they retired all they received was a Retiring Allowance of £1 a week from the Home Mission Board.[102] The superannuation scheme proposed by the Mission in 1949 gave all Maori ministers and probationers in native status an account in a new Home Acquirement Fund, into which would go personal contributions and subsidies from the Church. The Mission would also seek to raise a sufficient

---

99 Ibid. 1935, p.28.

100 Laurenson, pp.232-3.

101 MAC, 1949, p.122.

102 Ibid. p.101.

sum of money for those men now in the work, in proportion to their years of service and in recognition that no provision had before been made. The yearly annuity of £52 would continue.[103] These were measures to remove the most glaring financial inequalities between Maori and Pakeha in ministry.

Finally, the status of the native minister itself began to disappear. The last Maori minister to be ordained into native status was Ranginohoora Rogers in 1946. After this the Church made no further appointments of this type. In 1950 Eruera Te Tuhi, the Senior Maori Superintendent, became the first Maori to be received into full connexion and, thus, granted full equality with his European colleagues. Rangi Rogers was similarly received in 1953, as were three young Maori probationers, Rua Rakena, Te Awha W. Tahere and Lane Tauroa, in 1955-6. In 1959 the Maori Mission asked that the provision for the status of native minister be examined as to the desirability of retaining it in church law.[104] The following year the provision was removed. Those still in native status should continue so, but all future Maori candidates should take the full course of training and, if successful, be received into full connexion in the normal way.[105]

After almost one hundred years, then, the special status of native minister was discontinued. Irrespective of

---

103 Ibid. p.123.

104 Ibid. 1959, pp.155-6.

105 Ibid. 1960, p.229.

race, all ordained Methodist ministers were to be received into full connexion and given full ministerial status - they were to go through the same processes of selection and training, receive the same renumeration and have the same rights, privileges and responsibilities within the Church.

This was achieved, however, at a time when Maori within the Church were beginning to reflect on, and so re-evaluate, the nature of their work and ministry. In 1961 the Maori Mission reported to Conference that, although it believed there would inevitably need to be "a policy of ultimate integration of the two sides of the work", at present, and for some time in the future, it still saw a need for fostering "a distinct Maori Mission programme alongside the existing European pattern working in partnership."[106] The desire for a distinct Maori identity was expressed again in 1964, when the Mission sought to clarify and affirm its own understanding of the concept of integration, conscious as it did that this was not shared by some Pakeha. Integration, it declared, did not imply assimilation, for the assimilation of a people resulted in "the ultimate loss of all identity".[107] Assimilation, as Rua Rakena was to note in a study of 1971, was that state "in which the other group makes the decision as to what shall be accepted and what shall survive."[108] While many

---

106 Ibid. 1961, p.150.

107 Ibid. 1964, p.152.

108 Hartley & Thompson, quoted in Ruawai D. Rakena, The Maori Response to the Gospel, A Study of Maori-Pakeha relations in the Methodist Maori Mission from

Pakehas might "consciously believe this to be the direction that our relationship should take", said the Mission, "Maoris on the whole do not." It saw the integration of Maori and Pakeha as being instead a coming-together of two races who have been able to retain and develop their own distinctive gifts to the mutual benefit of both.[109]

The Mission could see the distinctive gifts of traditional Maori leadership being exercised in the ministry of its Maori and honorary home missionaries. When the home missionary order had been discontinued in the late 1950s, the Maori Mission had continued using honorary home missionaries, invoking "a kind of locally initiated leadership and giving this recognition."[110] In 1966 the Mission noted that these were men without "academic or theological training but with ability to use the Maori language in speech and song, and with an extensive knowledge of tribal history, tradition and genealogy...." It was this "identification in depth" that allowed them to be accepted as leaders, and enabled them to seek "a distinctive Maori response to the Gospel they proclaim." This, then, was a style of ministry and leadership the Mission coveted for all Maori men in ministry.[111] It was the direction in which it was soon to move.

---

its beginnings to the present day, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.25, Nos.1-4, August, 1971), p.2.

109 MAC, 1964, p.152.

110 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.95.

111 MAC, 1966, pp.172-3.

These kinds of reflections were followed in the 1970s by two major changes to Maori ministry. The first was the result of renewed calls for a separate Maori Board to superintend Maori work. In 1970 this idea was given strong advocacy at Conference, where it was endorsed in principle. The following year Rakena spoke of the need to "implement without delay the policy of promoting a self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating church among the Maori people."[112] This was partly realised in 1973 with the inauguration of the new Methodist Maori Division, with Rakena himself as its first Tumuaki. The Division has finally given Maori ministry the autonomy it has been seeking since the late-nineteenth century. It has also sought to realise a distinctive Maori identity within the Church, "Maori styles of Christian life, witness and service...a Maori response to the Gospel...reinforced by a wider recognition and appreciation all round that 'culture shapes the human voice that answers the voice of Christ'".[113]

The second change to Maori ministry has been its significant move away from the European model of a theologically-trained, ordained and stipendiary ministry. Very little has been recorded in official reports about the reasons for this decision, and it remains a sensitive one within the Church today. However, since the 1970s there

---

112 Rakena, pp.31-2.

113 Rakena, quoted in Davidson, p.123.

have been no more Maori candidates for the stipendiary presbyterate. The last Maori Division student to train at the Theological College was Diana Tana, there as a deaconess-in-training between 1973 and 1975. By 1982, then, Maori Division was reporting that its stipendiary ministry had been reduced to only nine. It was now relying very heavily upon the work of some twenty-eight or so self-supporting Minita-a-Iwi ("ministers of the people").[114] The minita are the re-named honorary home missionaries, and they offer a locally-based, lay ministry in their tradition. Many, then, are respected elders who are already acknowledged leaders within their local communities. They are not ordained for sacramental ministry, but are given annual permission by the Conference to celebrate holy communion. They are trained within, and according to the priorities of Maori Division. Although recognised as being in leadership and ordained ministry, they are not dependent upon the people for their living. The minita embody Maori Division's realisation that "the centre or focus for all Maori life, including its worship is based on each local marae or ancestral home of the people...."[115] This, then, should also be the centre or focus of Maori ministry, and so it has become.

---

114 MAC, 1982, p.126.

115 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, pp.95-6.

CHAPTER 4

THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES FOR ORDAINED MINISTRY

Between 1880 and 1980 the selection of candidates for the Methodist Church in New Zealand took place in three main stages. Candidates entered the process at their local circuit, moving from there to their district synod and then finally to the Conference. Although these basic steps remained the same throughout the period, there have been major changes both in what was required at each, and in the part played by each in the final decision as to whether or not a candidate should be accepted for ministry. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries then, the selection of candidates for the Wesleyan presbyterate in New Zealand rested with those who were already ordained. Selection depended upon a series of decisions made by large committees on the basis of certain written and oral tests. Significant change to this process began in the 1930s when the laity gained a more influential role within selection procedures. Further developments in the late 1960s turned the process quite on its head so that selection now depends upon one decision made by small skilled groups on the basis of a more subjective and personal evaluation.

A reading of the Laws and Regulations of the Wesleyan Church of New Zealand suggests that, in the 1880s, the selection of candidates for the ministry took place largely at the local circuit or district level. According

to the 1885 Law Book, those wishing to candidate had first to receive the nomination of their Superintendent Ministers at the Quarterly Meeting of the circuits to which they belonged. The Superintendents had to examine candidates on Methodist theology, doctrine and discipline; hear them preach (with other members of the Quarterly Meeting); and assure themselves of their "blameless life...decided piety, and general fitness for the itinerant work". If candidates gained the approval of the Quarterly Meeting, their Superintendents would recommend them on to the Annual District (Ministerial) Meeting.[1]

Before the Ministerial Meeting sat candidates were required to read the Large Minutes (this possibly refers to the Law Book with alterations printed in the Minutes of Conference), and the Church's "standard doctrinal works" (Wesley's Notes on the New Testament and his fifty-three sermons), and to give a trial sermon before at least three ministers appointed by the District Chairman. They then appeared before the District Meeting, where they gave accounts of their conversion, their call to the ministry and their present religious experience. They would be examined by the Chairman or another appointed minister as to their acquaintance with the "Doctrines and Institutions" of Christianity, their knowledge of Wesley's writings and the Methodist discipline, and their freedom from "secular incumbrances" (probably in the form of debts or a wife). If

---

1 Handbook, 1885, p.35.

satisfied, the Meeting would recommend candidates on to the Conference.[2]

The Conference would decide whether or not to receive candidates as Preachers on Trial "after such examination and inquiry as [it] may deem necessary." Just what such inquiry would entail was not actually specified. It may, for example, have involved the setting-up of ad hoc committees at Conference for further interviews. The Conference, however, would vote, bringing the selection process to an end. Those received as Preachers on Trial would now either go into Theological College, straight to circuit work for a time or onto a List of Reserve until a suitable place became available.[3]

Around the turn of the century some changes were made to these procedures which did not seek to alter their basic pattern but rather to achieve some improvement in standards and some more co-ordination at a national level.

The Church's concern for an adequate academic standard was reflected when, in the 1890s, it introduced a written examination for candidates.[4] This consisted of a section on Bible Knowledge, Theology and Church History, to be sat by all candidates; and a section on General Knowledge, which included various languages, geography, history, science and mathematics, and was to be sat only by

---

2 Ibid. p.36.

3 Ibid.

4 This has first been found in MAC, 1896, pp.89-90.

those without their university entrance or matriculation examination. Candidates' results were to go to their District Meetings. As Anderson notes, "...Methodists never required of their ministers an intellectual standard comparable to that which [for example] the Presbyterians sought."[5] So, where candidates for the Presbyterian ministry were required to be university graduates, those for the Methodist ministry were only expected to have passed their matriculation or an equivalent. However, there was still a feeling within the Church - expressed in the introduction of this examination - that present standards needed improvement. The College itself was soon to be pressing for a further improvement, although matriculation would not become a necessary condition of candidature until the mid-1940s.

In 1910 Conference established a new, national committee to take over the direction of the whole selection and training process. This Examination Committee would sit prior to the meeting of the Ministerial Committee of Conference, receiving all reports concerning probationers, students and candidates, and making all of the relevant recommendations to Conference. It would also conduct oral examinations and its members would be involved in hearing trial sermons. The members of this important new co-ordinating body - the President and Secretary of Conference, the Chairmen of the Districts, any members of the Board of

---

5 Anderson, p.35.

Examiners attending Conference, and ten other ministers to be chosen by the President - were all to be ordained.[6]

After these changes the selection process remained virtually untouched until the mid-1930s, when questions were raised regarding the role and composition of the Examination Committee. As the Methodist Times remarked, "The voice of the layman...[was]...heard as to what opportunity is available to the Church as a whole to determine the fitness of prospective ministers...."[7]

The Times was reporting the debate that had arisen at the 1935 Conference during discussions on the Theological College. Certain of the laity had questioned the practice whereby the recommendations of the Examination Committee as to who would be accepted or rejected as ministerial candidates, students or probationers were formally moved at Conference without a supporting statement of facts, and were then accepted without discussion.[8] They felt that the laity did not have enough information about, or input into, the selection process. Frank Thompson, a lay representative from the Connexional Secretaryship Committee, expressed the feeling that the laity were voting largely in the dark, and that sometimes men were received whose suitability for the work was later seen to be doubtful. He spoke of the need, then, for "a little more rigidity" in imposing tests of

---

6 MAC, 1910, pp.10-11.

7 NZMT, 1935, March 16, p.5.

8 Ibid. March 30, p.2.

fitness. W.S. Mackay, of the Local Preachers' Association, also thought that some who went through training were proved by experience to be "ministerial misfits". He remarked that many lay people had "serious misgivings" about such matters, and even felt that the Examination Committee was "more or less a secret society." He agreed that there were some things regarding candidates and others that could not be disclosed in open Conference, but he suggested that "at least some laymen might be called into the Committee and their knowledge of some of the cases be made available for guidance." In supporting this idea of lay representation on the Examination Committee, R.C. Clark, from Pukekohe, pointed out that in the Presbyterian Church ministers and laity were equally represented on all committees, including that concerned with the selection of students for the ministry. "In this respect he thinks the Methodist Church is behind the sister Church in democratic constitution." (Such an aspersion was not appreciated by W. Wills, who replied that "In no Church is the polity more democratic than in our own....") Finally, J.M. Thompson, from Hutt, argued that the Quarterly Meeting, where lay people were represented, was the place where the necessity for careful scrutiny was the greatest. Even there, however, information was not always forthcoming; sometimes, he said, its members knew nothing about the proposal to receive a candidate until his name was actually brought before the meeting.[9]

---

9 Ibid. March 16, p.5.

These concerns were strongly expressed, and various members of the ministry were drawn to respond, particularly, it seems, to the allegation that some of their number were "ministerial misfits". Dr.Laws, the ex-Principal of the Theological College, ventured to assert, for example, "that in no church is there a smaller proportion of ministerial misfits...and in no church is the entrance to the ministry more jealously guarded." He was supported by the present Principal, Dr.Ranston, who affirmed the value of ministerial training, saying that the great majority of students showed good results, while pointing out that it was not always possible to tell, during training, how students would turn out. Some of the men who seemed rather slow in their studies, for example, did "exceptionally good work" when they entered upon their ministries.[10]

Over the next five years, however, moves were made to address the two main concerns raised by the laity at the 1935 Conference.

The Church looked, firstly, at the question of lay representation on the Examination Committee. The activities of the Committee had been defended in one of the articles appearing in the Methodist Times soon after Conference, its writer stating that it would be "unfortunate if the impression became general that there is any lack of care and thoroughness" in the Committee's work. In his opinion the tendency was rather towards "a raising of the standard and a

---

10 Ibid.

proper enforcement of discipline." He did, however, consider the appointment of "select laymen of judicial capacity and with the requisite knowledge of our standards" to sit with the Committee while it looked at candidates to be "a matter for fair discussion." Laymen were now sitting with the July Committee of the British Methodist Conference for a similar purpose, although, as the writer noted, the functions of the Examination Committee far exceeded those of that body (including, for example, the right to deal with questions of character and conduct, which, under the Methodist Union, were reserved for the consideration of ministers only until they reached the Conference Committee of Complaints and Appeals).[11]

The 1935 Conference had resolved to increase the membership of the Examination Committee, but only by adding more ministers (the Connexional Secretary, the General Secretaries of the Home and Foreign Missions, and the Youth Director).[12] In 1936, however, a committee was formed to consider the question of lay representation, and, in the following year, it recommended that Conference approve such representation as a general principle.[13] In 1938 the Law Book Revision Committee suggested that lay representation on the Examination Committee be limited to "those with specialised knowledge or wide experience". It then resolved

---

11 Ibid. March 30, p.2.

12 MAC, 1935, p.28.

13 Ibid. 1937, p.30.

that three lay people be appointed, from those at Conference, by the President in consultation with the Secretaries of Conference and the Board of Examiners and the Principal of the Theological College.[14] This became law in 1939, giving lay people the opportunity to be involved with the ordained in this very significant part of the selection process.

The Church addressed, secondly, the question of the suitability of candidates. In 1939 Conference established the Commission on Ministerial Training to consider the whole question of the acceptance and training of students.[15] The report the Commission produced in 1942 looked at procedures in regard to candidates, students and probationers, and declared that regulations and procedures concerning pre-College training and the admittance of candidates needed strengthening "so as to raise the general standard of those accepted for training." This it proposed doing in a number of ways.[16]

The Commission suggested raising the academic standard required of candidates by making what had only been an expectation into more of a requirement. It did this, however, while retaining an alternative option for those who were less academically-minded. Thus either University Entrance (as it now was) or School Certificate (newly

---

14 Ibid. 1938, pp.168-9.

15 Ibid. 1939, p.126.

16 Ibid. 1942, p.32.

instituted as a general education in 'core' subjects) was to be regarded as a "normal minimum academic qualification" for candidates.[17]

The report also proposed making changes to the various steps in the selection process. At the local level, for example, it sought to give Quarterly Meetings both more time and more opportunities to get to know their candidates. Superintendent Ministers should thus be required, if possible, to give six months notice of their intention to nominate candidates at the September Quarterly Meeting. Sometime during the intervening period, members of the Meeting should form a small committee to interview candidates and to consider an Examination Committee questionnaire (to be filled in by the Superintendent). They would then report on their findings to the September Meeting. This would mean that the Superintendent would not be the only member of that Meeting to have met candidates in some depth, and so its decisions as to whether or not to recommend candidates should now be based to a greater degree on its own knowledge of them.

The report suggested using these small sub-committees at both the district and national levels too. They could meet candidates privately - or "by such personal contacts as...[they]...may see fit to adopt" - before they appeared before their District Ministerial Committees or the Examination Committee. Reports would be made back to those

---

17 Ibid.

full committees and should be given "careful consideration". The Commission hoped that such small committees would "ensure a more thorough application of the appointed tests for Candidates". They would certainly be able to meet with them on a more personal level than either the District Committees or the Examination Committee (the 1928 Law Book set the size of the latter at twenty-three plus such members of the Board of Examiners as might be attending Conference). They would thus enable those full committees to make selection decisions based, as in the circuits, upon an improved knowledge of their candidates.[18]

The Commission's proposals for the formation of small sub-committees of Quarterly Meetings and District Ministerial Committees for the purpose of selection became Church law in 1944.[19] There was no mention within the new laws, however, of the formation of a similar committee for the Examination Committee. Neither was there any mention of the Commission's suggestion that, where two or more candidates were appearing before the District Ministerial Committee or the Examination Committee, each should be examined separately.[20] Candidates' appearances before the Examination Committee, then, still contained the potential to be rather harrowing experiences. One who candidated in the late 1940s was Fred Baker, who remembers candidates

---

18 Ibid. p.33.

19 Ibid. 1944, pp.165-7.

20 Ibid. 1942, p.33.

being paraded in a long line before the Committee and examined one by one.[21]

The changes that had been made to the selection process were still significant however. The addition of the sub-committees had strengthened the process and helped to make it a little less fearsome and a little more personal. These were changes that were to foreshadow the future direction of Methodist selection procedures.

The way the Church chose its candidates would remain basically as it was, however, for some thirty years more. It was not until the late 1960s that the selection process again came under close scrutiny, as once more the Church began to question the different steps in the process and the structure set up to oversee it.

In 1965 Conference asked that the Board of Studies, with both lay and ministerial co-opted members, review the Church's selection procedures.[22] Although that large committee had not been formed by the following year, some of its concerns had been made apparent when, in preparation for its work, Dave Mullan was asked to present a report, on the basis of his research, concerning the use of psychological tests in the selection of candidates.[23]

Interest in this kind of testing had already been shown in some areas of the Church. In 1962, for example,

---

21 Interview with Fred Baker, 8 September, 1988.

22 MAC, 1965, p.41.

23 Ibid. 1966, p.39.

Eric Hames, the Principal of the Theological College, had reported that, at the beginning of the year, new students had been put through an intelligence test, "with results that were helpful in planning their work, and which have been justified during the year." He suggested that the Examination Committee consider the practicability of testing all candidates prior to them appearing before it.[24] However, the Special Committee on Students and Candidates, to which this was referred, thought that this idea should be "approached with caution". It expressed concern that results should always be held in the strictest confidence and kept in the hands of a very few. The Church took this advice, resolving in 1963 that, although the long-range programme of using IQ tests with accepted students be continued, a report should be made at a later date on the validity of using such tests for candidates.[25]

The results of Mullan's survey three years later would be seen by the Board of Studies "to confirm the reasoning" behind this decision.[26] However, the issue of psychological testing was still a concern to some. It would emerge again when the full Committee on Selection Procedures finally came together. Set up in 1967, with David Williams as Chairman and Mullan as Convenor, the Committee warned the Church that it was making "a wide survey of selection

---

24 Ibid. 1962, p.129.

25 Ibid. 1963, pp.132-3.

26 Ibid. 1966, p.39.

procedures for the Protestant ministry in this country preparatory to considering what may be radical changes in our present system."[27]

The Committee on Selection Procedures introduced its main ideas to the Church in 1968. These kept the selection process in the direction it had begun moving in thirty years before. In a background paper for Synods the Committee argued that the primary need in selection procedures was for "better subjective evaluation of the candidates rather than more highly sophisticated test instruments." That is, the Church should be seeking a better assessment of candidates at a personal level. It should be working out ways for selectors to really get to know candidates deeply and personally, rather than trying to develop ever more complex methods of testing, like, for example, the suggested psychological tests. The Committee made two suggestions as to how this could be achieved. The first was to form District Committees which might meet candidates at some depth. The second was to hold a national retreat to be attended by all candidates and some of their selectors.[28]

These proposals had received the general support of most of the Synods, which the Committee felt to be a "clear endorsement" of its work. Major changes to the selection process were not immediately proposed, but Conference did

---

27 Ibid. 1967, p.41.

28 Ibid. 1968, pp.54-5.

authorise the Board of Studies to organise a trial retreat for all candidates in June or July of the following year.[29]

In 1969 the Committee presented the Church with experimental procedures which were based on, and developed, its ideas of the year before, and which it considered might help to solve the various problems it could see with the Church's present procedures. These new procedures retained the general outline of the selection process - so candidates still moved through a series of encounters, beginning at their local circuit level and ending at the national Conference - but made extensive changes within this pattern.

The Committee believed that the movement of candidates through the selection process as a whole needed to be more assured. In its opinion there were too many points in the process at which clear-cut judgements were required - "realistic procedures would call for some limit on these." So it suggested that votes should no longer be taken on the acceptance or rejection of candidates at either the Quarterly Meeting or the District Ministerial Committee. Aspects of the attitudes of those two committees might be reflected in the reports they made, but they would no longer be able to reject candidates, preventing them from moving on to the next step in the selection process. The process was, thus, no longer to be a succession of decisions.[30]

---

29 Ibid. p.55.

30 Ibid. 1969, pp.65-6.

The Committee also thought that those making selection decisions often lacked both the ability to make them and the knowledge on which to base them. Selectors needed appropriate skills, and, above all, they needed knowledge - most importantly "the greatest personal knowledge of the candidates and of the nature of ministry." While the Committee accepted that "extensive knowledge may be obtained through the use of a sophisticated test battery", it was still convinced that nothing would replace good subjective evaluation - "adequate personal and group interview by those who are most directly involved in the selection process" - as the best way of acquiring that personal knowledge of candidates. As in the year before, these were the ideas underlying the Committee's suggestions for the creation of district candidate committees and a national selection weekend.[31]

The role of district candidate committees was an extension of that proposed for the district sub-committees thirty years before. Like them, they would offer opportunities for getting to know candidates at depth. In the suggested procedures, then, candidates would be encouraged to make contact with the committee in their district as soon as they let their Superintendent Minister know of their interest in ministry. The committee would then be available to give early guidance and counselling. When candidates had reached a firm conviction and seen their

---

31 Ibid. p.65.

Quarterly Meeting, the committee would assume primary responsibility for them. As well as having more meetings to get to know their candidates, this meant supervising certain of the conditions they were required to fulfil. These still included reading the Law Book, studying some of Wesley's sermons (only six since 1967, when "their relevance for study in the mid-twentieth century" had been questioned[32]) and doing a trial service. The written examination, however, would no longer be a requirement. Since 1954 the examination had been in biblical and theological subjects only, but now it was to be discontinued altogether. The Committee believed that written tests were of "only limited value". In its opinion the Church needed to know about "potential and ability, not about achievement in respect of subjects that will be studied in college." This idea had actually been expressed a few years earlier by the Lay Preachers Association, as it questioned the need for candidates to be accredited local preachers:

> It was agreed [it said] that whilst the Association required 'proof' of a member's ability to preach, the Theological College only required 'proof' that a candidate had the aptitude to be trained in all matters of the ministry.[33]

Rather than sitting the examination, candidates were asked to submit "some suitable written work", such as a statement on their understanding of the nature of the call to the modern ministry.[34]

---

32 Ibid. 1967, p.36.

33 Ibid. 1963, p.69.

As at present candidates would appear before the District Ministerial Committee, which would also assess (but not vote on) a report from the district candidate committee. Candidates would then go on to attend a national selection weekend. A trial weekend had been held in 1969 and judged a success. There candidates "were met in relative leisure, counselled at some depth, and valuated simultaneously by a small group of selectors." This was to be the model for future weekends. Candidates and selectors would meet together for a number of personal and group interviews and discussions (looking at, for example, the nature of vocation and other theological issues). Candidates would perform devotional and other tasks, and complete various tests - not intelligence tests, but the Theological School Inventory or the Motivational Analysis Test (both looking at motives for entering ministry), and possibly a standardised personality inventory. All of the candidates' reports and written material would also be available to selectors. On the basis of all of this accumulated knowledge, then, the selectors would finally vote, at the end of the weekend, on the acceptance or rejection of the candidates. The names of those who received a unanimous recommendation for acceptance or rejection would be presented to the Examination Committee without detailed information and they would no longer be required to attend Conference. Only the names of those who were the subject of some division of opinion or some concern

---

34 Ibid. 1969, pp.65-6.

would be considered in full by the Committee and so would need to attend Conference.[35]

These new procedures were adopted by the 1969 Conference for a trial period of two years. During that time they gained the general approval of the Church; and so the district candidate committees, the national selection weekend and the principle of subjective assessment, which they embody, have become permanent parts of the Methodist selection process. As Mullan has commented, they have "provided for a much deeper knowledge of the candidate, a more effective comparison with other candidates and ministers and rather more sophisticated methods of evaluation than had been used hitherto."[36]

As the Church worked through these changes to its selection process, it also began again to look more closely at the structure co-ordinating that process. In 1967 Conference directed the Secretary and the ex-Secretary of the Board of Examiners to consider the constitution of the Examination Committee "in the light of changes in the system of examining and with a view to the reduction of membership, the increase of efficiency and greater participation of the laity."[37] In the following year it appointed a committee to investigate these concerns in consultation with the

---

35 Ibid. pp.65-7.

36 David S. Mullan, "Ministerial Selection, An Investigation into Selection of Ministers for the Methodist Church", Massey, 1972, (Diploma of Education), p.4.

37 MAC, 1967, p.42.

Committee on Selection Procedure,[38] and in 1969 that committee presented its report to Conference.

The report began by pointing out that, for some time, there seemed to have been a "general dissatisfaction with the constitution and functioning of the Examination Committee." To many people the Committee (which now had over one hundred members) was "a large unwieldy body of people who, with little special aptitude or training, are seeking to fulfil a number of different (though related) tasks - such as the selection, examination and training of candidates for the ministry." Once again, then, the skills of those involved in the whole selection and training process were being questioned. The Church's method of working was, thus, seen to be unsatisfactory, especially if compared with the way other organisations (like, for example, business firms or teachers training colleges) performed similar functions.[39]

The committee thought that it would be better for the Church to start again from scratch, rather than trying to alter its present system. So it suggested disbanding the Examination Committee and the Board of Examiners, and establishing instead:

> ...a single body of reasonable size to have general oversight of all matters specifically related to the ministry, while at the same time leaving the specific tasks of selection, training, etc., in the hands of those best qualified to do these jobs.

---

38 Ibid. 1968, p.53.

39 Ibid. 1969, p.62.

Here the committee acknowledged that those involved in the selection and training process had to have appropriate skills. It suggested that this larger body - to be called the Committee on Ministry - should have forty members, all of them ordained. Its special sub-committees would include a Ministerial Training Committee (of 12 ministers and 4 lay people), with the Board of Studies as its executive (made up of 6 ministers, 2 lay people and 4 members of the Theological College staff); and a National Selection Committee (of 2 ministers and 2 lay people).[40]

These changes in structure were referred to Synods for consideration, and in 1970 the committee reported that their responses indicated they were in favour of changes along the lines suggested. However, the one area of real disagreement was in relation to the Committee on Ministry. Two of the Synods had recommended it be dropped completely, while the others thought that it should include some lay people.[41] This request should not have surprised the committee too much, for, as noted, the "greater participation of the laity" had been one of the Church's professed intentions in initiating the review of its selection structure in the first place. This was really a battle that had been won thirty years before, when the laity had fought for and gained the right to sit on the Examination Committee.

---

40 Ibid. pp.62-3.

41 Ibid. 1970, p.52.

In the light of these reactions the committee offered the Church some modified proposals which saw lay representation greatly increased. The Committee on Ministry was now to have 39 members, 11 (28.2%) of whom were to be lay. Its task, with the help of its sub-committees, was defined in three main areas - selection (nominating those for the National Selection Committee - still with 2 ministerial and 2 lay members - and receiving and presenting its report); training (considering, with the Board of Studies, matters relating to the curriculum and the course of study for each trainee); and the care of the ministry (looking at matters relating to the nature, function and welfare of the ministry). The Ministerial Training Committee was now absorbed into the Committee on Ministry and its work taken up by the Board of Studies, which - now made up of 4 ministers, 4 lay people and 4 members of the College staff - was also more evenly proportioned.[42]

The 1970 Conference gave this modified structure "general approval" and, as it attracted no unfavourable comment from Synods, the committee assumed that it was now agreeable to all.[43] However, although the proposals were adopted for experimental use, the composition of the new Committee on Ministry would continue to fluctuate as, over the next few years, the Church struggled with, what it

---

42 Ibid. pp.52-4.

43 Ibid. 1971, p.66.

believed to be, the conflicting issues of its role and its representation.

In its final report of 1971 the special committee had emphasised to the Church that one of the main functions of the Committee on Ministry would be the pastoral one of "gather[ing] up and deal[ing] with all those important matters which either directly or indirectly involve the welfare of the ordained ministry...." It had, thus, recommended the appointment of an additional member to the Committee, a Secretary of Examinations, who, by co-ordinating examinations, would give the Committee's Convenor more freedom to exercise such a "truly pastoral function".[44] By the following year, however, after "further consideration", the special committee had decided that the Committee on Ministry was "too large and unwieldy to function effectively", for such pastoral work was better done by a smaller body. In its opinion, Conference "had given undue weight to the factor of representation." In a memorandum to Church Council, then, it suggested reducing the Committee's membership to twenty-one.[45] Conference, however, was not so sure, for there were still those who believed representation to be an important issue. So it resolved that the question be referred back to the Council for its further consideration, "particularly with regard to

---

44 Ibid. pp.66-7.

45 Ibid. 1972, pp.114-15.

having greater lay representation." In 1973 Church Council proposed the membership of the Committee be set at thirty.[46]

By the early 1970s, then, the Methodist Church's selection process had undergone two major changes. The first had involved change to the different steps making up the process, so as to give those making selection decisions an improved and more personal knowledge of candidates. The second had seen change to the way the process as a whole was co-ordinated, in order to make an unwieldy and unbalanced structure more skilful, more efficient and more representative.

Significant as these changes were, some still felt the need for more. As early as 1972, an alternative selection process was being proposed by Dave Mullan in a paper written for his Diploma of Education. This continued to develop the ideas already put in place, while also drawing on some of the new thinking going on in the Church around this time.

Mullan believed the Church needed a general programme of selection and training that would achieve three things. Firstly, although he agreed that the new selection procedures had provided for "more effective and realistic assessment than was previously the case", he still saw a need for "re-evaluation" in a number of areas. In his opinion, there was "ample intuitive evidence" to suggest that an even greater and more reliable knowledge of

---

46 Ibid. 1973, p.106.

candidates was required. Significant restrictions, for example, were imposed by the short time available to district and national committees. This compounded the problems selectors had trying to get behind the 'fronts' candidates put up. He also thought that "more explicit criteria" for selection were necessary. The Church had recently become cautious about giving candidates theological examinations, but, queried Mullan, "might there not be some other indices of ministerial performance which could be identified and established and used as criteria....?"[47]

Secondly, Mullan saw a need to improve the kind of training the Church offered those involved in its ministry. Although he considered the College course gave "a reasonably good grounding in the basic disciplines" and allowed students of all kinds of abilities "to grapple at a more or less appropriate level with the theological issues involved in ministry", he was still concerned that perhaps it had too great an "academic and philosophical orientation". He pointed to the increasing desire among the ordained and their people that training for the modern ministry be made "as relevant and practical as possible".[48] He also believed the Church should be more willing to provide adequate training for its lay people, in order to equip them for more effective service in their existing situations.[49]

---

47 Mullan, "Ministerial Selection", pp.5-7.

48 Ibid. pp.7-10.

49 Ibid. p.10, 21.

Finally, Mullan saw the need for a programme that would allow for the introduction of alternative forms of ministry. As noted, the Church in the early 1970s was beginning to think seriously about such alternatives, and Mullan was one who believed there was an "urgent need to develop a wide variety" of these.[50] He also realised, however, that if the Church did move in this direction, some of its present regulations and expectations relating to ministry would "seem to be rather inflexible." The Church would need, for example, to develop new but appropriate means of selection and training for those who were prepared to enter "some limited and defined spheres of service without necessarily being committed to the ordained ministry" as it was presently understood.[51] He also believed that the introduction of new forms of ministry should complement an enhancement of the traditional, ordained ministry. He saw this in terms of an increased professionalism, which could take the form, for example, of making the qualifications for ordained ministry "rather higher than they are at present, with more emphasis on academic and professional standards."[52]

Mullan's programme was developed with all of these needs in mind. It would begin with an initial selection from candidates who were interested in any form of lay or

---

50 Ibid. p.17.

51 Ibid. pp.10-15.

52 Ibid. pp.16-18.

ministerial training or service. Assessors would be looking for an interest in 'ministry' or service, "but not necessarily a 'call' to ministerial service and certainly not necessarily the vocation to the full-time ministry."[53] Those selected would go on a twelve month training course, which would combine practical experience in a variety of ministerial situations with an integrated programme of in-service and residential theoretical training. Towards the end of this course the question of future vocation might be raised. Now, however, it could be done so "in the context of the greatest knowledge",[54] for the year would, firstly, have provided candidates with "a broad and adequate background in which they could assess themselves in the work of the ministry and confirm their own motivations and interests and aptitudes." Some might, therefore, decide not to go further, and they would return to their home churches as more effectively trained lay people. Others would want to go on and they would enter a selection process better able to receive them, for the year would also have given to the Church an extensive knowledge of its candidates in various appropriate situations.[55] Selection decisions could then be made based on individual needs and abilities revealed during the year. Some candidates might be suitable for immediate appointment to a church position - perhaps as

---

53 Ibid. pp.18-19.

54 Ibid. pp.1-2.

55 Ibid. p.22.

members of a new diaconate - others might benefit from advanced training at the Theological College, possibly still in conjunction with a church appointment.[56]

This was a programme Mullan thought would go some way towards meeting "the hope for flexibility and creative progress" in the selection, training and deployment of Methodist ministers.[57] It offered much greater opportunities for candidates to learn about themselves and the nature of ministry, and for selectors to really get to know candidates. It suggested a training, both practical and theoretical, that candidates would find worthwhile whether or not they went on for further study or ordination. It was open with possibilities to include those interested in a whole range of alternative ministries. The programme, however, does not seem to have ever been formally put to the Church. Selection procedures retain, for the most part, the form they were given in the late 1960s, although significant change has occurred - just as Mullan predicted it would need to - to one of the basic concepts underlying them, as a result of the development of new forms of ministry in the Church.

As noted, the late 1970s saw the development within New Zealand Methodism of the non-stipendiary presbyterate, a ministry firmly rooted in the setting of the local parish. This has meant a new emphasis has emerged within the

---

56 Ibid. pp.1-2.

57 Ibid. p.5, 25.

selection process. The Church no longer has to wait, as it did in the past, for candidates to come forward and express their 'secret' call. Now it has "the opportunity of taking the initiative [itself] with experienced, qualified lay leaders and inviting them to consider preparing themselves for ordination" as self-supporting ministers in their local situation. This invitation is followed by an important 'strategy' consultation, at which the abilities of the prospective candidate and the needs of the local congregation are critically examined to ensure that they match. All of this means that, unlike those for the 'general' ministry, candidates for the non-stipendiary presbyterate begin their preparation for ministry "with the sense of having been chosen to meet this particular need."[58]

The late 1970s also saw the Methodist selection process drawn into the faltering, but persistent, movement for church union. In 1973 Methodist candidates took part in a Joint Assessment Course organised by the churches negotiating for union. Conference approved this involvement and was willing that it continue. It discharged its own National Selection Committee, resolving that its duties be assumed by the Committee on Ministry with a new, annually appointed, National Assessment Convenor.[59] The first Convenor was Dave Mullan, who became the Church's representative to the Joint Assessment Committee, formed

---

58 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.77.

59 MAC, 1973, pp.75-6.

later in 1973. Although this Committee was to organise two ecumenical assessment courses every year for the rest of the decade, the Methodist and the Presbyterian Churches were the only ones to regularly attend. By 1981 the Committee on Ministry was recommending that the Methodist Church should withdraw from the courses to once again hold its own single course.[60]

Changes to the Methodist selection process have, for the most part, emphasised the need for the skilled and personal evaluation of candidates. This increasingly self-conscious concern for expertise may, as it was for relevancy, have been a reflection of the Church's growing awareness of the decline (in, for example, numbers and social influence) of its clergy. A more expert, modern approach might be the answer, and so the Church developed selection procedures that would not be out of place in a management consultant's.

---

60 Ibid. 1981, p.629.

CHAPTER 5

EDUCATION FOR ORDAINED MINISTRY

New Zealand-based education for ordained ministry within the Methodist Church was established from as early as the mid-nineteenth century. Since then it has developed in many different directions, always facing, however, one continual tension. This was, and is still, the tension between the desires for an academic and a more practical form of training. Between 1880 and 1980, then, the Church's ministerial education has mostly taken place in two separate phases, each an attempt to meet the need for such different forms of training. Candidates thus spent time as students of the Theological College, usually following this with a period of training and testing as probationers in a parish situation. Although there has always been a certain amount of flexibility and coming and going between these two, by 1980 hard and fast distinctions were disappearing for increasing numbers of candidates with the introduction of the Church's new home-setting programme of training.

Methodist involvement in New Zealand-based theological education for ministry began in 1844, when an institution for the training of Maori pastors and teachers was established by the Wesleyans on land given by Governor Fitzroy in Grafton, Auckland. Here the first "Native Ministers" were trained - Hamiora Ngaropi, H. Waiti, Wiremu Patene and Hohepa Otene. In 1849 the institution was moved

out to a larger site and farm at Three Kings, where an "effective educational programme was continued." It was, however, forced to close during the Land Wars of the 1860s.[1]

At this stage, however, there was no such institution for the training of European ministers. Little need was felt for one while the majority were still coming from England, as most were trained there. As the nineteenth century wore on, however, the New Zealand Church began to provide more and more of its own clergy. It found its candidates in the sons and relatives of missionaries (George Brown, who began work in Samoa in 1861, was a nephew of the early missionary Thomas Buddle); in young immigrants (William Morley left England in 1863 at the age of 21 intending to serve in the New Zealand Maori Mission); and in men who had grown up in the pioneer community (William Gittos, who entered the ministry in 1856, was brought up in the Hokianga). Most of these indigenous ministers, however, were thrust straight out into parishes as probationers. They were simply "planted in the wilderness to do or die." Except for a reading course required of those on probation and, if they were lucky, the guidance of older colleagues, they received no training. That the majority did survive was due to the fact that, as Hames points out, in these early days they did not need to be theologians, but rather "ardent believers, with a love for Christ and men, a tough body, and plenty of gumption."[2]

---

1 Lewis, p.3.

These early days were passing, though, and as they did the need for a more general theological education would grow more urgent. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, "by an inexorable law", the Church's "mission approach was giving way to the pastoral".[3] That is, the Church was moving out of a pioneering pattern, where its main concern had been to expand, into more of a suburban pattern, where its concern was rather to consolidate. This meant inevitable changes to ministry. The expectation of cheap and rapid ministration to small communities which could afford no more was replaced by the desire for stable and substantial ministration to larger and growing communities which were prepared to be ambitious.[4] Secondly, as the century drew to its close and the new one began, the Church had increasingly to face the effects of free and compulsory education. Rising educational standards in New Zealand meant that clergy would have to be more than "travelling evangelists", whose message was exhausted in a year or so, when they had to be moved on.[5]

By the 1880s, then, Methodist theological education had been resumed and substantially extended. Three Kings was re-opened in 1876, now as a training institution for Maori boys and for both Maori and European theological students. The European students were to assist with general

---

2 Hames, Out of the Common Way, pp.54-5.

3 Ibid. p.102.

4 Anderson, p.28.

5 Hames, Out of the Common Way, pp.99-100.

teaching.[6] Although described as "a makeshift beginning" to theological training, the resources necessary for a more adequate provision were just not available. As yet the Church had no endowments worth mentioning, and the local circuits were too heavily committed paying off mortgages on their new churches and parsonages to be able to accept much connexional taxation.[7] For another thirty-six years, then, Methodist theological education continued to search for a home of its own. In 1895 the students were moved from Three Kings to form the senior department of the secondary school, Prince Albert College, back in Auckland on Queen Street. There they remained until the College closed in 1906 and they were forced to move again, this time to a boarding house in upper Grafton Road. Lectures were held in the Pitt Street church. In 1911 another move took them to a house on College Hill. The following year, however, a separate and permanent theological institution was at last established at "Dunholme" in Remuera, with its own full-time Principal, C.H. Garland. Here the College would remain for sixteen years, gaining, during that time, a second full-time Tutor, Harry Ranston.[8]

The theological training Methodist candidates for the ministry received at these early colleges was characterised by two important emphases.

---

6 Lewis, p.3.

7 Hames, Out of the Common Way, p.79.

8 Lewis, pp.3-4.

The first emphasis was on the improvement of students' general educational and cultural standards. There were two reasons for this. Firstly, the Church was concerned that its ministers attain, not the kind of intellectual standard sought by, for example, the Presbyterians - for within Methodism there was a certain suspicion of an intellectual, "bookish" ministry that might lose its evangelistic zeal[9] - but, rather, "a reasonably cultured standard" matched by "a warm evangelism".[10] These were the qualities possessed by a man like, for example, C.H. Garland, Principal of the College between 1912 and 1918. Hames describes Garland as "the perfect principal" - although without an academic, university background, he was "well read and intelligent, of a type that the English Wesleyans were producing at that date."[11]

Secondly, the College's general education was just what most of its students required. As already noted, post-primary education in this period was largely the preserve of the wealthy. "The average theological student of that era needed secondary education more than anything else the college could do for him, with access to the University when he could take advantage of it."[12]

---

9 Hames, Out of the Common Way p.129.

10 Anderson, p.35.

11 Hames, Out of the Common Way, p.130.

12 Ibid. p.129.

Not surprisingly, given these two factors, it took Methodist students quite a while to take advantage of such access. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that a Methodist minister became a university graduate. So important did this scholastic event seem to the President of the 1899 Conference, however, that he drew attention to it in his Presidential address, offering the new graduate, C.H. Laws, the congratulations of the Church, whereupon the Conference responded with "hearty applause".[13] By 1900 2 more ministers had acquired university degrees (to make a total 2.42% of all ministers and probationers); this had increased to 6 (4.11%) by 1910, and 11 (5.5%) by 1920.[14]

The three-year College course, then, included a wide range of non-theological subjects; such as English language and literature, classics, Latin, mathematics and mental and moral science. According to Hames, Prince Albert College turned out ministerial trainees whose general cultural level was equal to anything the Church has since produced.[15] This was achieved, however, while the College's theological studies remained poorly developed. Students had a "smattering" of lectures in biblical and theological subjects (like, for example, systematic theology and biblical exegesis), ecclesiastical history, languages (Greek and sometimes Hebrew), Methodist polity and homiletics.

---

13 Dr. C.H. Laws in NZMT, 1947, October 25, p.201.

14 See Table 6.

15 Hames, Out of the Common Way, p.126.

This teaching, however, has been described as "primitive to the point of absurdity, even for those days" by C.H. Laws, an early student at Three Kings,[16] and "still sketchy and amateurish" at Prince Albert College.[17]

The demand for this emphasis to be changed seems to have come from the Theological College itself, and to have been based on a desire for training to be more relevant to the work of the ministry. In 1912 the College asked that Conference re-affirm "its conviction that all candidates for the Ministry should aim at matriculation as an educational standard."[18] In 1917 it further suggested that candidates should be steadily moving towards that goal for two or three years before they entered College. Unless they had reached such a level, it maintained, their term at the Theological Institution would not give them the training and advantage for which it was designed. That training should not be of "a secondary school character"; instead it should be "specially suited for...[the students']...work as Methodist Ministers." That is, it should bear directly upon their future occupations. This did not mean placing barriers before suitable students wanting to receive higher secular education, but here the Church recognised that such education was not for all. It was resolved, then, that the Board of Studies should ascertain the educational status of

---

16 Ibid. p.79.

17 Ibid. p.126.

18 MAC, 1912, p.55.

each student on entering the College, to determine which should follow a university career, and which should begin more direct preparation for the work of the ministry. Above all, it had now been laid down as a principle that all students should be receiving training which was directly relevant to their work as ministers.[19]

The second important emphasis in the ministerial education of this period was more obviously of this kind. Much time and attention was given during training to developing the art of preaching.

This was done in a variety of ways. Students were given lectures in homiletics and elocution. They practised conducting services within the College, facing the comments of their fellow students and the staff afterwards. These criticism services were initiated in 1889 and aimed, said the Principal, Alexander Reid, "to blend kindness to the preacher with fidelity to the cause."[20] For some students, however, they could turn into never-to-be-forgotten ordeals. Dr. Laws' irritated foot, tapping from the back pew, was, for example, apparently enough to make anyone's confidence vanish completely, although it was also true that he "would counter a too severe student criticism with a word of encouragement for the victim just as surely as he would cut down a tendency to eulogise."[21] Students also preached in

---

19 Ibid. 1917, pp.78-9.

20 Ibid. 1889, p.62.

21 Lewis, p.12.

various circuits around Auckland on Sunday mornings, sometimes taking very many services indeed. In 1913 C.H. Garland reported to Conference that, during the last six months, the nine students in residence had taken more than 300 services. He was of the opinion that it was not to their advantage to preach so frequently, and so it was decided that students should conduct no more than thirteen services in any one quarter.[22] Finally, students were required to annually preach trial sermons before appointed ministers, who marked them and made reports to the District Synod - "almost invariably a quite fearsome ordeal".[23]

Theological education of this sort for Methodist students in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was followed by a four-year period of probationary training. This involved taking up a parish appointment, as yet with authorisation to administer the sacraments only if need be, under the supervision of an older or more experienced minister.[24] However, as Anderson remarks, those on probation "had a tough life, and survivors deserved the ordained status that lay at the end of the road!" Probationers were generally appointed to small town or country areas where, although fresh out of College, and expected to build up causes that were often struggling, they tended to be left without the guidance they needed.[25] On

---

22 MAC, 1913, pp.101-2.

23 Anderson, p.34.

24 Handbook, 1885, p.37.

top of these often exhausting parish demands were set those of a very heavy reading and study programme, with both oral and written annual examinations. Probationers were not well paid (while the ordained received a stipend of £200 in 1912, for example, probationers were only paid £140),[26] and, as already noted, they were not at liberty to marry until they had finished their term. The power of probationers to effect much change to this system was limited because, although members of most circuit meetings, they had no voting rights in either their District Meeting or the Annual Conference.[27]

Probation was, thus, a very strenuous form of testing and would remain so well into the twentieth century. By the 1920s, for example, it was still able to resist those who would see it change. During the previous decade, "largely owing to the effect of war conditions", the Church had accepted a number of men without any College training for probation, and so had been ordaining them after only four years.[28] In 1925 an attempt was made to lighten the load of training for those probationers who had spent the usual three years in College. The Board of Studies was asked to consider either shortening the length of their probation, or remitting their written examinations for one

---

25 Anderson, pp.35-6.

26 MAC, 1912, p.96.

27 Handbook, 1885, p.37.

28 MAC, 1926, p.132.

or more of their probationary years.[29] This request, however, was denied and three main reasons given. Firstly, the Board assured the Church that the present situation was "fast passing away", and that in the future untrained men would only be received on probation in rare cases. Secondly, the Board warned that a shortened probation would inevitably lead to a greater number of candidates wanting to marry earlier, and pointed to the strong reluctance within the circuits to accept this. Finally, the Board expressed its belief that ministerial education should not be relaxed but rather needed to be kept to a demanding standard:

> The more thorough is the training and oversight in study and Circuit work which is given our younger men the stronger will be the Ministry of the Church. Men of zeal will not object to such a training, and men who may find it irksome are those who need it most.[30]

There was, thus, to be no relaxation of probationary requirements.

While the Methodist Church of the 1920s was not yet convinced of the need to revise its system of probationary training, it was, however, very busy with plans to build a new centre for its theological training. C.H. Garland died in 1918, and the Conference of the following year appointed C.H. Laws to be the new Principal. It was understood that, in accepting this appointment, "he was to lead the connexion in providing a worthy home" for the theological institution.[31] This he did, for it was he who "conceived

---

29 Ibid. 1925, p.40.

30 Ibid. 1926, pp.131-2.

and shaped the final plans and gave the necessary driving force to the campaign" for the new Trinity College.[32]

The foundations for the College had been laid some thirty years before by the vision of two Auckland laymen. In 1893 John Probert, of the Pitt Street congregation, died and left the residue of his estate (£11,135) to the Church for the establishment and support of a theological college. This was named the Probert Trust, and into it went money bequeathed by Thomas Emsley, who had died in 1885, leaving the Church £3,000, half of which had been allocated by Conference to a theological endowment fund.[33]

The Church wanted its new college to be as near to the new University site as possible, and so it was eventually decided to build on the old "Native Institution" site on Grafton Road. The Methodist church on the corner could be moved a few yards down Carlton Gore Road - releasing its site for the College's main block - to become the Collegiate Church and Chapel. The idea of attaching a suburban church to the College had been raised in 1919, as a means of enabling students to "undertake definite Church and Sunday School work under adequate supervision and thus secure a better training in the practical side of Church work and in the administration of our system of church government."[34] Then deferred until the decision about the

---

31 Hames, Coming of Age, p.46.

32 Dr. H. Ranston in NZMT, 1947, October 25, p.201.

33 Lewis, p.5.

34 MAC, 1919, p.73.

College's new site was made, this idea could now be realised. By 1925 the Grafton Road church had become a part of the College, providing a new context for ministerial training in its continuing congregation and Sunday School. Staff and students took three-quarters of its services; students also conducting a weeknight service fortnightly, and taking turns to help Dr. Ranston with pastoral work.[35]

In the meantime Dr. Laws was canvassing up and down the country and raising $47,000 for the new College. In 1927 its foundation stone was laid by the Governor-General, Sir Charles Fergusson, and on February 27 1929 the new Trinity Theological College and Hostel was opened.[36]

"If Trinity College was built by Dr. Laws, it was Dr. Ranston who gave it its life of scholarship."[37] Dr. Ranston became Principal of the Theological College on the retirement of Dr. Laws in 1931, and held that office for the next ten years. During that time the academic standard of the College was lifted considerably, "to a level that it has never lost since."[38] One tangible sign of this was that the number of ministers and probationers with university degrees kept rising, and in fact doubled, from 15 in 1930 (7.08% of all ministers and probationers) to 30 in 1940 (13.27%).[39]

---

35 Ibid. 1925, p.83.

36 Lewis, pp.3-4.

37 Ibid. p.13.

38 Hames, Coming of Age, p.47.

39 See Table 6.

Dr. Ranston was not always popular within the wider Church however. Writing in 1947, he said that there had been times during the last twenty-nine years when criticisms had been made of the "modernism" of the staff. "I have been dubbed a 'devil's advocate' and even a 'Jesuit in disguise'". His reply was that the teaching had been, and was, "progressive and abreast of sound critical investigation", but that it had also ever been "true to the great Christian essentials with their Methodist emphases."[40]

However, Dr. Ranston - like those before him - believed that the training of ministers needed to be more than academic. In his report to the 1938 Conference, for example, he stated:

> It never was, and is not the aim of the teachers to send forth men who are merely or mainly learned scholars, but rather men with the necessary intellectual and spiritual equipment for a permanently effective evangelical ministry. Reading for University degrees, highly as this is valued, is not allowed to interfere with the ordinary studies of the men.[41]

As J.J. Lewis points out, Dr. Ranston believed the evangelical ministry should be equipped both in skills and in depth of understanding.[42]

For all this, however, an academic emphasis was still quite firmly established within Methodist theological training. One expression of this was the elaborate examination system that had evolved by 1920. This combined

---

40 Dr. Ranston in NZMT, 1947, October 25, p.201.

41 MAC, 1938, p.98.

42 Lewis, p.13.

internal exams in each subject at the end of each term, with an end-of-year external exam on the whole year's work set by Conference assessors. Marks thus "became the key to assessment". They were compiled in comparative tables and sent to the Secretary of the Board of Examiners and Conference. The College staff were called to account for any general lowering of grades.[43]

This system proved very difficult to repeal, although attempts were made at different times. In 1927, for example, the Conference resolved that its annual examination "be discontinued, and that the third term examination cover as far as is practicable the work of the whole College year."[44] Unfortunately nothing has yet been found in either the Journal or the Methodist Times as to who sponsored this resolution or why the Conference decided to pass it. Only a year later, however, it was rescinded and examinations continued as before.[45] It would be "some thirty years before the College could break free" of them.[46]

The examination system was, in part, a reflection of the connexion's desire to keep "a watchful eye" on the theological institution.[47] The wider Church was not afraid to express its concerns for ministerial training, and in the

---

43 Ibid. pp.15-16.

44 MAC, 1927, p.42.

45 Ibid. 1928, pp.34-5.

46 Lewis, p.16.

47 Ibid. p.15.

1930s these were voiced loudly and often, centering around the issue of "Religious Education", and forcing the College to reflect on and defend its own priorities for training.

Religious education emerged as an issue in 1929, when, in its Conference report of that year, the Welfare of the Church Committee deplored the loss of Methodist Sunday School scholars, and so made two recommendations to the Theological College. It suggested that its curriculum be arranged so that two hours a week were devoted to subjects that would qualify students for effective leadership of Sunday School workers; and that the Collegiate Sunday School be taken over as a school of practice to enable students to gain practical experience in the methods and organization of a modern Sunday School.[48]

These ideas were referred to the College Council, which, in the same year, produced a report setting out its thoughts on ministerial training for Sunday School and young peoples work, and general church work. This too was concerned that students should be receiving both theoretical knowledge of, and practical experience within, these fields. In the area of youth work, then it pointed out that all students were already attending a variety of relevant courses (such as, for example, a three-lecture series on "Young Peoples Work and Sunday School Organization" given annually by E.P. Blamires), and that the College was planning to introduce a special course for those in their

---

48 MAC, 1929, p.54.

third year on "Child Psychology, the Principles of Pedagogy and the Qualifications for General Religious Leadership". Third-year students would also be required to attend the re-organised Collegiate Sunday School, taking part in its work for one term, and to visit and report on the work of a large graded Sunday School in Auckland. All students were to attend, in regular turn, the Collegiate Bible Class. A series of special Sunday evening services would also be initiated, to give first and second-year students opportunities for putting into practice the principles of religious education.[49]

The College planned to give its students more experience in general church work by involving them in aspects of the Church's pastoral, mission and business activities. It was intended, for example, that they should take part in house-to-house visiting in the area adjacent to the Collegiate church. They would be given chances to conduct open-air and evangelistic missions, with the advice and assistance of staff. They would also attend the Quarterly Meetings of a near-by circuit, and, if possible, the business meetings of the Collegiate church and Sunday School. As third-year students already attended a class which included church administration, Methodist law and the conduct of meetings, and second-year students a class in pastoral theology, the Council considered there to be "ample

---

49 Ibid. p.83.

opportunity for the discussion of many questions bearing upon Leadership in the Church."[50]

In 1930 the College reported that these measures had been carried out, and had "resulted in a most important development in the training of the men."[51] The Welfare of the Church Committee, though, was still not satisfied. It was still concerned about the "appalling failure of the Church" to hold its Sunday School membership - it was retaining, it said, less than 20%. So in 1931 it brought forward the recommendations it had submitted two years earlier, urging "that AT LEAST these...be approved in principle, and incorporated in the curriculum by progressive stages if necessary." The College was even asked to consider the appointment of a lecturer in religious pedagogy at an early date.[52]

The College Council replied to these charges by defending its own priorities for training. It was, it asserted, "fully alive to the importance of training the students for leadership in Religious Education." As there seemed to be "some lack of knowledge as to what actually has been done", it reminded the Church of the work students were doing (for example, their studies in education and their work in the Sunday Schools). However, it pointed out that its courses were constructed so as "to keep in mind the

---

50 Ibid. pp.83-4.

51 Ibid. 1930, p.87.

52 Ibid. 1931, pp.55-7.

needs of the whole work of the Ministry, which must be among both adults and young people." It also emphasised that students needed to be taught, not only how to teach, but also what to teach, for even "the finest methods fail without sound knowledge of the subjects." Finally, to the suggestion that "subjects of lesser importance" be trimmed from the curriculum, the Council replied that non-essential subjects were not taught at Trinity. Work such as classical Greek and Hebrew (presumably among the objects of the suggestion) was taken only by a few men in preparation for degrees.[53]

This defence, however, still did not satisfy everybody, and demands for increased instruction in youth work were to continue into the late-1930s and 1940s. In 1937, and again in 1947, for example, it was suggested that students attend the Auckland Teachers Training College to gain some experience in teaching methods.[54] The College had responded to the earlier demands with some not insignificant changes in 1929-30, but it had also reached the point where it felt that there had been enough change and to go much further would mean endangering certain of its other priorities.

In the late-1930s more attempts were made to modify the College's examination system. In 1938, for example, the Board of Studies was asked to consider eliminating the end-

---

53 Ibid. pp.92-3.

54 Ibid. 1937, p.95.
Ibid. 1947, p.101.

of-year annual examination.[55] The following year, however, the College Council stated that it was of the opinion that the system of external examinations was "necessary to safeguard the interests of the Conference." In other words, the Connexion should keep its "watchful eye". Some changes had been made during the year to the internal examinations, though, lightening their load a little, and these the Council recommended to the Church. The exams in the first and second terms had been confined to one week, and their papers shortened by half an hour. The third-term examination had been discontinued altogether.[56] The Commission on Ministerial Training of 1942 also recommended retaining the external examination, although it suggested it be in theological subjects only.[57] This the Church accepted, and it became law in 1944, which was also the year the end-of-year internal exam was reinstated.[58] Changes to the system were thus made very gradually.

The late-1930s also saw the beginnings of discussion about certain aspects of the Church's probationary training. Throughout this discussion a strong concern seems apparent to recover the purpose of probation and to make of it as useful a time as possible for those preparing for ministry.

---

55 Ibid. 1938, p.30.

56 Ibid. 1939, p.90.

57 Ibid. 1942, p.34.

58 Ibid. 1944, p.175.

In 1937 and 1938, then, some changes were made to the assessment of probationers. It was suggested, for example, that tutorial guidance by correspondence be extended, and that final assessment include such year-long work as well as examination results. It was also decided that examinations should cover subjects as a whole, rather than the more narrow subject-matter of only one text book as at present. This would hopefully encourage probationers in wider reading habits. A new curriculum for probationers, however, also gave students the opportunity to specialise in some subject with its inclusion of a 10000 word thesis to be completed in the third or fourth year of the course.[59]

The question of the stationing and adequate supervision of probationers was raised in 1939, when Conference asked that,

> ...more attention be given to the regulation whereby Probationers stationed in isolated circuits are placed under the personal supervision of a suitable ordained minister who shall take responsibility for oversight of studies and circuit work.[60]

This concern was expressed again in 1942, when the Commission on Ministerial Training called upon the Church to "re-emphasize the fundamental purpose of the term of Probation" and to give it more recognition in the way probationers were appointed. The Commission believed that the fundamental purpose of training should "take precedence over all other considerations in the matter of stationing."

---

59 Ibid. 1937, p.30.
Ibid. 1938, pp.25-6.

60 Ibid. 1939, p.31.

Supervision should then be of the sort that enabled probationers "to derive the utmost benefit from [the] personal counsel and practical guidance" of their supervisors. The Commission envisaged supervisors reporting on such things as the pastoral efficiency of their probationers; their preaching and administrative abilities; and their acceptability within their circuits.[61]

In the 1940s there were some staff changes within the Theological College which were to be very important for the future direction of its training. Dr. Ranston retired in 1941 and was succeeded by Eric Hames, who spent three years as Acting-Principal before taking up the full appointment in 1944. Three years later the College gained a new Resident Tutor, Dr. David Williams. These two shared the desire to see a greater emphasis placed upon the training of ministers for pastoral work. It was their combined vision that thus resulted in the significant shift that took place in ministerial education at Trinity over the next few years - the shift from the pulpit to the pastorate that saw the development of pastoral theology as a major discipline.

As already noted, early College training had placed a fairly strong emphasis on the place of the minister in the pulpit, and this still remained. By contrast, much less attention had been paid to the place of the minister in the wider pastorate. There had been scattered opportunities for

---

61 Ibid. 1942, p.35.

students to gain some practical pastoral experience (particularly in connection with the Collegiate church and when on supply), but not to consider pastoral theology as an integrated discipline in itself. A topic called "Pastoral Efficiency" was first included in the College curriculum in 1920 as part of a brief course for third-year students also covering circuit and Sunday School organization;[62] this was extended in 1931 when all students were required to take an hour a week of "Pastoral Theology and Homiletics".[63] In 1947, however, the curriculum was re-organised and, as a result, pastoral theology - "in the widest sense of that term"[64] - became a much more significant study of four hours a week in its own right. Led by Dr. Williams, it now included a three-year course in psychology (a general introduction followed by teaching and counselling, psychotherapy and the psychology of religion); a year each of homiletics, pastoral theology, worship and church organization; and weekly sermon criticism and voice production classes.[65] These changes so improved the study of pastoral theology that by 1951, after a visit overseas where he had come into contact with theological colleges in Australia and Britain, Hames could say that Trinity was "making a more thorough and expert approach to the problems

---

62 Ibid. 1920, p.25.

63 Ibid. 1931, p.26.

64 Ibid. 1947, p.98.

65 Ibid. p.31.

of the pastorate, in preaching, teaching and pastoral oversight, than any College I visited...."[66]

The "development and consolidation of the training given at the Theological College" was stated as one of the reasons for the Church's decision, taken in 1948, to shorten the length of probation. In its report of that year the Board of Studies continued to affirm the value of the probationary method, "especially when properly carried out by placing young men under the oversight of experienced ministers." It still believed that certain stringencies (in particular, the low rate of stipend and the postponement of marriage) were justifiable for the sake of the training. But it now considered that "some modification of the normal four-year Probation rule may be made without injury to the standard of the ministry." As noted, it argued this on the basis of what it perceived as improvements at Trinity. However, it was also facing the reality of increasing numbers of married men on probation, and having to acknowledge that "the practical experience gained in Home Mission work and while Student Pastors should be taken into account." For these reasons the Board resolved that normally the total years spent in College and on probation should now be six. This might be reduced to five for married candidates who entered from home mission work, and for candidates holding a Bachelor's Degree or equivalent at the time of their entry into College.[67]

---

66 Ibid. 1952, p.95.

As the Methodist College moved into new areas of training, its new Principal was also working to improve the quality of that training. Hames' concern for the overall standard of ministerial education was to be voiced again and again in his reports and resolutions of the 1940s and 1950s.

In his annual report of 1945 Hames noted that, during the year, there had been consultations between representatives of the theological colleges and the Academic Board of the University regarding proposed Degrees in Divinity.[68] Methodist support for such degrees went back at least thirty-five years. The Conference expressed its conviction that the time was ripe for their granting in 1911;[69] and both Dr. Laws and Dr. Ranston had been active in various approaches to the University in the 1920s and 1930s. Hames also supported the degrees. He pointed out that Methodism was "not likely to tolerate a ministry in which traditional tests of gifts, grace and gumption are subordinated to mere academic distinction"; but he also believed that if the Church discerned gifts and promise in its students, it must not grudge the money or trouble given to their training. Methodists, he said, had built a worthy home for their theological college, but much still remained to be done if they were "to keep pace with the rising educational standards of the age." (It should be noted here, however, that the 1940s saw a big rise in the number

---

67 Ibid. 1948, p.32.

68 Ibid. 1945, pp.96-7.

69 Ibid. 1911, p.100.

of Methodist ministers and probationers with university qualifications - by 1950 numbers had increased to 51, now 21.34% of the total ordained ministry).[70] In particular, he argued, "the Church must insist upon a higher standard of general education in men commencing their theological course", and he suggested the possibility of a year of preliminary training for students who were "less privileged".[71] These were two suggestions Hames was to repeat often.

In 1954 Hames set out what he believed to be the chief dilemna facing ministerial education - that basic tension already identified. "Our major problem", he said, "is to make the best use of the limited hours available. We have to balance the theoretical against the practical and general education against specialist training." So he asked,

> Should a man of moderate ability attempt to master his Greek Testament or the English, or both? Should he make himself at home in Shakespeare or in the Book of Job? Should he be encouraged to take an immediate practical share in the Church life around, learning by doing, or should he concentrate on theoretical studies? Is a University Degree worth the concentrated effort demanded, or should Divinity studies absorb all available energies? Should he keep his nose to his books, or join this and that and be a good mixer? Should he hold to the traditional theological disciplines, or use the modern psychological approach? Should he seek culture or professional competence?

These are the kinds of questions the Church has always struggled with - and continues to do so even today - when

---

70 See Table 6.

71 MAC, 1946, p.115.

thinking about the training of its ordained ministry. For Hames, the right answer, in every case, was "both, if time permits". However, as he knew, time did not permit for any but the most "able and vigorous" (if indeed them), and so he admitted that, under existing conditions, it was just not possible "to do thoroughly all that ought to be done."[72]

The solution Hames offered, both then and in the following years, was, firstly, that the Church improve the entrance standards of its candidates, for he believed that "consistently maintained [this] would make for much better results all round."[73] In the 1940s Methodist candidates were required to have either their University Entrance or School Certificate, but the law was amended in 1954 to make the latter the only academic qualification required of them.[74] Hames believed the standard should be higher. Most students, he argued in 1955, were not ready to work at the level or the pace that was necessary when they entered College. The disparity in their academic attainments was thus the "greatest obstacle to more effective teaching." Provision for an extra year did exist for those who needed a year of pre-College training, or who wanted to go on to advanced studies, but Hames was convinced, secondly, that the Church should establish a four-year course as the norm, to ensure that all candidates came to the basic three-year

---

72 Ibid. 1954, pp.101-2.

73 Ibid. p.102.

74 Ibid. p.33.

course better prepared.[75] He argued these points again in 1957, and in 1958, calling upon the Church to make "a resolute attempt to lift its standards", and contending that it was "not unfair to ask that candidates for the most difficult calling of the ministry should prove their ability to work at University level."[76]

In 1958 University Entrance was restored as a minimum entrance standard, although an alternative was again left open - this time in the Diploma course of the Church's new School for Christian Workers. Opened in 1960, one of the things the School offered was a year's full-time preparatory study for prospective candidates.[77] Of the 109 students who attended the School during its thirteen years in operation, some 40 would use this option for entering the Methodist ministry.[78]

The length of College training was one of the questions referred to the Special Committee on Students and Candidates for the Ministry established in 1962.[79] In 1964 the Committee reported that its members were agreed as to the desirability of a fourth year, which was to be devoted to specialised study and/or guided practical work. However, they did not believe that this extra year should be made

---

75 Ibid. 1955, p.107.

76 Ibid. 1958, p.120.

77 Ibid. p.124.

78 Lewis, p.35.

79 MAC, 1962, p.34.

available for all students, but only for those who were so approved. Their reasons for this policy included the inability of some students to benefit from a further year of study; the added financial strain that married students would incur; and, especially, the effect the extended course would have upon probation. A four-year College course would reduce the length of probation by another year, and the Committee believed that this would endanger the traditional relationship between superintendent and probationer "by which the period of Probation continues as part of the essential training for the ministry." This relationship, still considered to be the heart of the probationary method, was seen by the Committee as being much too valuable to lose. The wider Church agreed, and so voted to retain the basic three-year course for the majority of its students, receiving applications for a fourth year solely on the basis of individual merit.[80]

The 1960s saw Methodist education for ministry beginning to develop in new directions. These reflected old arguments and new awarenesses, and were to gather pace into the following decades.

The early-1960s signalled some important changes in the Church's theological training, particularly in regard to the way students were taught and assessed. In his report of 1959 Hames indicated the kind of change the College staff envisaged making to their teaching methods. "We intend from

---

80 Ibid. 1964, p.125.

1960 onward", he said, "to approach our work at a different level, with the emphasis less on lectures and more on independent but guided preparation by the student." However, although the 1959 Conference supported the principle of an "extension of the tutorial system", it did express concern as to whether the College had adequate staffing to cope with the work engendered by such changes, especially when taken in conjunction with the opening of the new School for Christian Workers.[81] The appointment of a fourth tutor was thus considered an "urgent priority".[82]

That appointment was made in 1962, enabling the College to make many of its desired changes. The addition of John Ziesler to the staff meant that it was no longer necessary to combine all of the students into single classes; each year could now be taught separately. This meant that students would begin subjects at the beginning, instead of at some point in a three-year cycle, and so resulted in a "more effective and intensive programme" overall.[83] The College was also able to further shift its emphasis from lectures to discussions and seminars. This made possible closer attention for the individual student and allowed for greater student participation.[84] Both of

---

81 Ibid. 1959, pp.125-7.

82 Ibid. 1960, p.129.

83 Lewis, p.38.

84 MAC, 1962, p.129.

these were to be continuing themes for ministerial education into and beyond the 1970s.

This period also saw the Theological College break free of the annual external examination. In his last annual report before retiring in 1963 Hames suggested that it was finally time the Conference examination be dropped. "Educationally it is an anachronism", he said, and "better ways have been devised for keeping the Conference informed and satisfied with regard to the work and life of the Institution."[85] The Special Committee on Students and Candidates, to which the question was referred in the same year, supported Hames, acknowledging the growing feeling that external examinations were not the best way to keep the College under the scrutiny still considered necessary. It pointed, firstly, to the difficulties external examiners had in keeping in touch with the rapidly changing field of biblical and theological studies - many were not specialists, but ministers with their own heavy responsibilities. It also noted that, even if they could do so, "much more is involved than academic efficiency" - there was more to College life, it was suggesting, than examination results.[86]

The Special Committee recommended, then, that external examinations be replaced by a system of triennial visitations. These visitations would be conducted by three

---

85 Ibid.

86 Ibid. 1963, p.132.

assessors (two ministerial and one lay), appointed by Conference through the Examination Committee, who would spend time with staff and students within the College environment itself. There they would be able to observe, and take part in, many different aspects of College life. They would bring a report on their experience and findings to the Examination Committee.[87] This recommendation was adopted by the Conference of 1963 and the new system introduced, now giving Conference "a much more intimate and accurate picture" of the Theological College. As Lewis notes, by setting College staff free of the requirements of external examinations, the visitations have also enabled them "to develop their disciplines in new and more imaginative directions."[88]

Finally, alterations were also made, during the 1960s, to the College's prize-giving system. Students had indicated their disapproval of any prize system and their unwillingness to receive prizes as early as 1932. "The motivation it sought to awaken was suspect and the final selection often invidious." The Principal now introduced a new system by which the prize, spread over three years, could only be won once by any student. This took the competitive edge from prize-giving and the prize itself became, in effect, "a book grant available to as many as possible."[89]

---

87 Ibid. pp.132-3.

88 Lewis, p.38.

The mid-1960s saw the beginnings of a prolonged debate within Methodism as to the future of its probationary system. The question arose in 1964 when the Faith and Order Committee was asked to "clarify the status of Probationers in relationship to the fully ordained ministry."[90] The report the Committee produced in the following year brought together many of the concerns expressed about probation over the past forty years, and offered some new suggestions for change.

The Committee's 1965 report echoed concerns it itself had raised in an earlier report of 1952, when it again suggested that the status of probationers within the Methodist Church was one that was fundamentally "anomalous". This arose, it said, because, although in theory those on probation were considered to be lay people, as the authorisation to administer the sacraments was only rarely withheld from them, "in practice and intention and in the understanding of the Church and of the Community...[they exercise]...a ministry equivalent to that of Word and Sacrament." Ordination when it came thus tended to be "merely a regularisation of what has already been permitted...." Such an anomaly was, the Committee pointed out, regarded by many within the Church universal as an offence. It was important for Methodists to be aware of this, particularly within the "developing ecumenical situation" of the mid-1960s. The formation of the new Joint

---

89 Ibid.

90 MAC, 1964, p.211.

Commission for Church Union (J.C.C.U.) in 1965, to now include the Anglican Church, was to mark the beginning of a new period in union negotiations in New Zealand. This new situation, said the Faith and Order Committee, demanded some clarification of the status of Methodist probationers and of the nature of their relationship to the Church.[91]

The Committee also repeated concerns first voiced back in 1925 and 1942, thus implying that, although the Church had tried to make changes, these problems were still not resolved. It noted again, then, that probationers were sometimes placed in remote areas without adequate supervision, and that many found it difficult to do justice to both their circuit work and their probationary examinations. Circuits were thus preferring to take ministers who were already ordained, especially now that many more probationers were married and so costing them just as much in stipends and allowances.[92]

Finally, the Committee went so far as to suggest that the original need for a probationary system had passed, now that educational standards had risen and most candidates were receiving the full College course. "It would appear", it concluded, "that there is no justification for continuing the probationary system as it is."[93]

---

91 Ibid. 1965, pp.277-8.

92 Ibid. p.278.

93 Ibid.

The 1965 Conference agreed that its probationary system did contain anomalies and affirmed the need for change "so as to preserve the benefits in the system." It was not yet ready, however, to take up the report's suggestions for change, which included ordaining students when they came out of College, but only receiving them into full connexion after a term in ministry; making a year of guided probationary work the fourth year of an extended College course, and introducing a system of unordained curacy.[94] The following year, then, the Board of Studies, to which the matter had been referred, put forward a number of recommendations which, rather than trying to radically alter the system, sought to improve the way it worked. The Board believed that probation should continue as a form of curacy, still with the aim of enabling each probationer "to receive practical training under the guidance of a Superintendent." However, it did want to lighten its load, and so it recommended both shortening the term of probation to two years; and discontinuing its written examinations in favour of a two-week period of in-service training under the direction of the Theological College for each of those years, and the preparation of a 20,000 word thesis prior to ordination. The Board also suggested ending the most blatant anomaly of the probationary system by withholding the right to celebrate holy communion, except in very special circumstances, until ordination.[95]

---

94 Ibid.

These recommendations were referred to District Synods for discussion. Their replies the next year reflected "a considerable diversity of opinion"; some in favour of retaining the present system, and others supporting the intention behind the report. All, however, noted the difficulties involved in implementing the proposals; the problems, for example, in finding a sufficient number of circuits with places for both a superintendent and a curate-probationer, and the probable expense to those circuits and the connexion. In the light of these replies, then, the Board of Studies stated that it did not think the Church would be ready to implement the recommendations by the proposed date of 1970. It also advised the Conference that union proposals - negotiations were still going strong with the member churches joining in an Act of Commitment to seek a Basis of Union and Ways of Common Action in 1967 - might suggest to it yet another option: that of a two-year curacy in the diaconate. As already noted, the Methodist Church was, from the late-1960s, to begin seriously considering the creation of a diaconate, and the suggestion that it include probationers would be contained within the Plan for Union. This was the alternative the Board itself now believed the Church should be working towards, for it saw it as the option that would deliver "practical training...within the Circuit Ministry under the guidance of selected senior Ministers." For the moment, then, it was satisfied that Conference "re-affirm

---

95 Ibid. 1966, pp.38-9.

the present policy of the Church' with regard to probation. This meant toning down its recommendations of the year before. The appointment of probationers to circuits where there was the possibility of adequate supervision was thus to be "a guiding principle" for the Stationing Committee. The authority to celebrate holy communion would be given "only where this is considered necessary in areas where, otherwise, Church members could be deprived of this means of grace." Probationers would now be offered the choice between sitting written examinations or presenting either a 30,000 word thesis or four 5,000 word extended essays.[96]

These proposals left the problems identified in 1965 essentially still unresolved, and so the early-1970s saw debate about the future of probation continue. In 1970 and 1971, then, the Faith and Order Committee produced reports examining some of the other options suggested for probation over the past five years. Included in the resolutions following the Board of Studies 1967 report, for example, had been the request that the Board investigate the possibility of ordaining students at the end of their College course, but not admitting them into full connexion until they had completed their term on probation. This, it was felt, would regularise the anomaly created when those legally considered to be lay performed many of the functions of the ordained. The Faith and Order Committee was reluctant to accept this option, however, for it thought that it could easily obscure

---

96 Ibid. 1967, pp.41-2.

the fact that probationers were still on trial and under supervision, not yet in full relationship with the Conference. The 1967 report had also, as noted, favoured ordaining probationers as deacons, which would give them the authority to preach and do pastoral work in the Church's name, but not to administer the sacraments. In speaking to this proposal, however, the Committee repeated what it had first affirmed nearly twenty years before; that it did not favour the introduction of a diaconate "merely as a stage on the way to the ministry." Only if a full diaconate was introduced would this be an acceptable alternative. The Committee also pointed out that neither of these options would solve the practical problems of the probationary system. The most they could do was to clarify the status of probationers, and this, it noted, was a clarity that could, for example, make a deacon less acceptable in remote or union causes. Probationers, though, would still be caught between the demands of their examination work and their circuit responsibilities; they would still be "as expensive and as hard to place in circuits where suitable supervision could be provided."[97]

The Committee believed that the best option for probation was that of a College course extended to four years by the addition of a pers in the College. Now, however, there would be "no doubt that a student would be in a circuit (or other situation) primarily to learn and to be

---

97 Ibid. 1970, pp.298-9.

tested, and not as an extra...in the circuit." With his or her status thus clear, the conflict of interests now existing between training and circuit responsibilities would be resolved. The course would, thus, be able to provide much more effectively the kind of in-service training originally intended as the purpose of probation. Those leaving College would thens in the College. Now, however, there would be "no doubt that a student would be in a circuit (or other situation) primarily to learn and to be tested, and not as an extra...in the circuit." With his or her status thus clear, the conflict of interests now existing between training and circuit responsibilities would be resolved. The course would, thus, be able to provide much more effectively the kind of in-service training originally intended as the purpose of probation. Those leaving College would then enter their first appointment with the full status of the ordained. It would now be quite clear at which point the Conference regarded them as fully authorised ministers.[98]

In 1970 the options discussed by the Faith and Order Committee were referred to Synods for comment. Like it, they were agreed - by a margin of 7:1 - that the four-year College course was the one to "best meet...requirements".[99] The details for the implementation of such a programme were thus referred on to a Special Committee on the Probation

---

98 Ibid. p.299.
Ibid. 1971, p.311.

99 Ibid. 1970, p.311.

System, and in 1972 this produced a report containing its proposed scheme for the use of the fourth year. This envisaged students spending two four-week periods in each of the first two terms of that year out in the field - one in each term on section in selected Auckland circuits, and the other in some specialised form of ministry, like a chaplaincy. Each of these periods would be followed by time back at the College, writing up reports about their experiences and taking part in tutorial groups related to those. Students would spend the third term working in some practical area of ministry of their own choice. They would also work, throughout the year, on a 'mini-research' project, chosen in consultation with the pastoral theology tutor.[100]

The special committee recommended that this new course become effective as from the 1972 Conference. However, there were changes occurring within the life of the College that meant the Church was now unable to make such a decision. The implementation of any new programme had to be put on hold "in light of recent developments in joint theological training in Auckland."[101]

The development of increased co-operation between the colleges, leading eventually to joint training, was one of three major changes to College life in the 1970s. It was set against the background of the church union negotiations

---

100 Ibid. 1972, p.64.

101 Ibid. p.80.

of the late-1960s and early-1970s. One of the "first fruits" of the Joint Commission established in 1965, then, was the Joint Board of Theological Studies, which had its origins in the Commission's Committee on Theological Training. The Board brought into close association Trinity, St. John's and Knox Colleges, and the Colleges of the Congregational Church and of the Associated Churches of Christ; providing them with a new forum for co-operation. It had its first meeting in February 1968, and by October of that year had launched a new joint course - the Diploma Licentiate in Theology (L.Th.).[102] Dr. Williams was able to report to the 1968 Conference that "quite a number" of Methodist students would be presenting themselves for the new course's papers.[103]

The possibility of forming united colleges had been raised in 1965 at a J.C.C.U. Consultation on Theological Training, where it had been agreed that, in a united Church of the future, there should be at least two centres of theological education - one in Dunedin and one in Auckland. The Warden of St. John's College, Canon Foster, used this opportunity to invite the negotiating Churches - the Auckland-based Methodist and Congregational in particular - to join the Anglicans in a joint College on their Meadowbank site. This invitation was renewed in 1970, when Canon Foster wrote, in a letter to Trinity's Acting-Principal,

---

102 Lewis, p.45.

103 MAC, 1968, p.184.

J.J. Lewis, that he had been authorised "to enter into discussions with you concerning future developments between our respective Colleges and of theological training in Auckland." This initiative resulted in significant meetings between the staff of the two Colleges in October 1970, and members of the Trinity College Council and the Executive of the St. John's Board of Governors in July 1971. Both were in favour of bringing the work of Trinity and St. John's together to form a united Theological College on the St. John's site. In 1971, then, this recommendation was brought before the two Churches' governing bodies.[104]

The proposal for a joint College was considered by those involved in these discussions to represent "a positive response to the changing ecumenical situation" of this period. From the beginning the suggestion had been regarded as appropriate for Churches who had joined in an Act of Commitment, and as embodying the World Council of Churches' Lund Principle of doing all things together that could be done without loss of principle.[105] In this context Lewis describes the decision to unite as "an act of faith and something in which to believe."[106] The decision was an act of faith in more than this regard, however, for the very first meeting of 1970 had approved the project as being "within the realm of possibility whether or not union takes

---

104 Lewis, pp.47-8.

105 MAC, 1971, p.290.

106 Lewis, p.49.

place".[107] The new College was, thus, considered to be both in tune with the move towards union, and independent of it. It should take place "irrespective of the decision to unite the churches."[108]

The College Council could also see some more pragmatic reasons for the formation of a joint College. It pointed, for example, to the pooling of resources that would result, enabling "the development of multiple courses for the equipping of a diversity of ministry." It also noted that the housing of staff and married and single students on campus would provide them with "a much needed experience of community".[109] Trinity's life together as a community was something it had become increasingly aware of as a result of the growing numbers of married students accepted for training in the 1960s. College life had been significantly enriched by the presence of students' wives, who appeared around the campus, meeting together regularly and even attending some classes. They added "colour, interest and humanity to the community."[110] However, because they were married, a large number of students were now no longer in residence on campus but, instead, were living in student pastorates scattered around the city. Noting in 1968 that 12 of the College's 20 students were living off campus, the

---

107 MAC, 1971, p.286.

108 Ibid. p.290.

109 Ibid. p.291.

110 Lewis, p.39.

College Council remarked that this did not "help to build the life of the community".[111] This concern had been evident two years before, when morning prayers were shifted from 7.30am to the later time of 9.50am to make it easier for non-resident students to attend. Now, believed Dr. Williams, the married men felt that they were "really included in the devotional life of the College."[112] An evening communion service, initiated in 1969, was a similar attempt to draw non-resident students into "closer devotional fellowship".[113] Neither of these moves, however, addressed the real problem of non-residence, and by 1971 only 2 of the College's 17 students remained on campus. The Theological College had, said its new Principal, J.J. Lewis, virtually disappeared. It had lost its sense of community, and had become a day school or - as College staff were spending so much time and energy in the care of the Hostel - merely a Hall of Residence for the University. Students were being deprived of the stimulus that came from being a community - from living and working and worshipping together - a stimulus now acknowledged to be an essential part of their training for ministry.[114]

For all of these reasons the 1971 Conference authorised the continuation of combined teaching (some of

---

111 MAC, 1968, p.182.

112 Ibid. 1966, p.145.

113 Ibid. 1969, p.269.

114 Ibid. 1971, p.289.

which had actually been taking place since 1969), and of negotiations "with a view to establishing a united college under a Joint Board in 1973."[115] In 1972 Methodist students spent four mornings a week training at St. John's, also joining the Anglicans in some combined worship. The joint Theological College was officially inaugurated the following year.

The coming-together of the two Colleges has been a significant step in the life of both. The meeting of two traditions, and of two administrative structures, has inevitably caused some tension, but, as the College Council said in its first report back to Conference, "through a deepening spirit of community within the student body and good relationships between the Staff, the problems have in fact become creative and enriching."[116] The long-term influence each tradition is having upon the other will gradually emerge within their church life and in all sorts of areas. The wearing of the ecumenical alb by many Methodists when they leave College is one of the more obvious signs. Problems remain, but to be faced, for, as Lewis notes, "There can be no crying peace when it does not exist. Cheap ecumenism is as uncreative as cheap denominationalism."[117]

---

115 Ibid. p.292.

116 Ibid. 1973, p.253.

117 Lewis, p.53.

The 1970s also saw the College involved in "a thorough reappraisal of [its] styles of learning and methods of training." This was prompted by the visit of the 1972 Selwyn lecturer, Canon Basil Moss, and was expressed in a desire for a training which, although retaining a basic core of learning and skills, was more specifically tailored to meet individual student requirements. Throughout the decade, then, the College would be concerned to gather appropriate courses and programmes around the needs of its students, rather than trying to fit them into its own moulds. This meant looking for a diversity of approach, with methods of working open to negotiation.[118]

The College sought to increase its flexibility through the make-up of its curriculum. In 1972, then, it was able to report to Conference on the range of courses and assessment available to students. It believed the L.Th. offered students opportunities for both practical and theoretical study in biblical and theological, as well as pastoral and cultural fields, although still leaving enough space for creative research. Its end-of-year examinations provided a "useful external test" and a standard that could be compared overseas for those desiring it. Independent of the L.Th., however, it awarded a College diploma to every student who completed a satisfactory course. The assessment for this was based on personal as well as academic development, and was vocationally directed.[119] In 1971 the

---

118 Ibid.

College had initiated an orientation week which included separate interviews where students could discuss these sorts of options and, as far as possible, arrange a course to meet their individual needs.[120] The early-1970s also saw the College beginning to consider revising the actual structure of its three-year course - around, for example, the cycle of "Tools, Themes and Thesis" - leaving the third year free for elective work. It believed that this would "permit the development of [students'] particular interests and skills",[121] as well as offering them a way "to respond to questions arising from living situations in Church and community."[122] Here the College was expressing its desire that training give students opportunities to be more involved in living situations. In 1974 it was agreed, then, that the College year be extended to make possible further practical training programmes.[123] Five weeks of "supervised intensive practical work" in any one of a variety of situations (serving, for example, in a circuit or as a chaplain in a hospital, prison or industry) thus became an integral part of the College year.[124] Finally, in 1976 the College year itself was divided into semesters, which offered courses in units, enabling students to select their

---

119 MAC, 1972, p.279.

120 Ibid. 1971, p.288.

121 Ibid. p.289.

122 Ibid. 1972, p.279.

123 Ibid. 1974, p.268.

124 Ibid. 1978, p.213.

courses from a number of options while still keeping an essential core of biblical, historical, theological, pastoral and cultural studies.[125]

The third change to College life in the 1970s involved it in a greater awareness and appreciation of the Church's multi-racial character. This, however, might be seen by the cynical as too little too late. In the 1930s the presence of Maharaia Winiata and Ranginohoora Rogers, the first Maori students to be received for the full course of training, had introduced students to glimpses of Maori culture.[126] By the 1960s Rogers, now Superintendent of the Auckland Maori circuit, was lecturing in Maori to both elementary and advanced classes at the College. It, however, was not yet prepared to appoint someone on a more full-time basis. One such request in 1968 was told that the College was encouraging students to take advantage of Maori Language weekends (organised by the Maori Mission) and "other opportunities".[127] In the early-1970s weekly classes in Maori language and culture continued under Rua Rakena, with the whole College - students and staff - attending. The College also began to make weekend visits to local marae (one of the earliest to Ngawha Springs in 1973). By 1978 it considered these experiences to have become "integral to the College life and work".[128] These moves, however, were being

---

125 Ibid. 1976, pp.246-7.

126 Lewis, p.22.

127 MAC, 1969, p.267.

made while Maori Division was making the decision not to encourage any of its candidates for ministry to attend the Theological College for training. The reasons for this have, as noted, never been officially recorded. The decision in itself, however, is enough to indicate dissatisfaction with the College on the part of the Division. For all the changes it was beginning to make (none of which could really be called radical), the College was not, it seems, able to fulfil the needs of its Maori students. They were no longer prepared to be involved.

Since this time, then, there has been no contact between European and Maori students for Methodist ministry within the Theological College. Methodist students at College do, however, live, work and worship with Anglican Maori students, and with an increasing number of Polynesian students from both Churches. As the Polynesian component of the Methodist Church grows (faster than any other), this is a particularly important contact. The 1980s have seen the College work much harder at preparing its students for ministry in a changing multi-cultural society. Maori language and cross culture courses are now compulsory for all students, for example, as is a three-year Te Kaupapa Tikanga Rua bi-cultural programme. The increasing use of Maori, Samoan, Tongan and other Pacific languages has become a very normal part of College worship. In these sorts of ways the College tries to reflect the commitment made by its parent Churches to a genuinely multi-cultural future.

---

128 Ibid. 1978, p.213.

While these changes were taking place to education for ministry within the Theological College, others were occurring which would emphasise, instead, the important and valuable place of training beyond the College. The 1970s would see, then, the development of new continuing education and home-setting programmes.

The Methodist Church's concern for a deliberate policy for continuing education emerged in 1971, when Conference asked that J.J. Lewis convene a committee to prepare some guidelines for a Post Ordination Training strategy.[129] The committee's report of the following year supported the need for such a strategy, arguing that the professional nature of the ministry demanded it. The ministry, although affirmed as a form of servanthood by the committee, was also, in its opinion, "an occupation which like others requires certain specific skills and involves particular professional responsibilities, standards and dedication." The committee was concerned - like others within the Church around this time - that the ministry maintain "a high degree of professional competence." This did not mean giving in to mere "professionalism", but the ministry was not, the committee asserted, for amateurs. It required, then, a "sustained and systematic programme of continuing education" - a "career-long exercise" of refining and expanding skills and knowledge.[130]

---

129 Ibid. 1971, p.67.

130 Ibid. 1972, p.308.

Conference responded to this report positively by asking the Committee on Ministry to appoint a new sub-committee to take responsibility for a continuing education programme; and by passing a number of resolutions aimed at helping ministers to take advantage of these sorts of educational opportunities. It resolved, for example, that circuits grant up to seven days leave per annum (with subsidies up to $25 per annum) to encourage ministers to attend continuing education courses; and that they consider paying their ministers book allowances.[131]

Ecumenical developments in continuing education followed these moves a year later. In 1973 representatives of the negotiating Churches held a consultation at St. John's, where they considered the possibility of some joint enterprise in post-ordination education. This led to the appointment, by St. John's and the Joint Board of Theological Studies, of Keith Rowe as the Churches' first ecumenical Field Worker in continuing education. His tasks were to include putting clergy in touch with resources and providing them, and offering leadership for a large number of clergy schools. This pioneering venture was to prove an important one for the "effective working and good health of the Church's Ministry."[132]

It was in the light of these developments in continuing education, as well as those already noted in the

---

131 Ibid. p.313.

132 Lewis, p.54.

College's training, that the Church finally approved, in 1974, the introduction of the four-year course proposed in the 1960s. The basic three-year College course was now to be followed by only one year on probation in "supervised training".[133] This was "intended not to be a year of further study but...of engaging in ministry", thus changing the whole philosophy of strenuous probationary testing. Probationers were asked to produce only one piece of written work to do with "the process of engagement in ministry". This was to be discussed at a meeting of the probationers, but was not for evaluation or assessment.[134] The new scheme began in 1975, in which year District Assessors were appointed to help provide "a more effective appraisal of candidates for ordination in the shortened period of probation."[135]

The Church's new home-setting programme was developed as an alternative means of training for its non-stipendiary presbyters and deacons. It has been well described as a "commitment style of education".[136]

Those who train in the programme are educated in their home settings and while actively engaged in ministry. Unlike College training, there is, thus, "to be no separation between doing the work of ministry and preparing

---

133 MAC, 1974, p.75.

134 Letter from Dave Mullan, 1 August, 1988.

135 MAC, 1975, p.56.

136 Ibid. 1984, p.281.

for it."[137] In the home-setting programme the two go hand-in-hand. Students commit themselves to an immediate local ministry. They are also committed to study under an individual learning covenant. These are initiated, as far as possible, by their own perceptions of their educational needs for ministry, and geared to the specific ministry they are engaged in. Students are thus encouraged to state their own learning goals and objectives. They may draw upon formal programmes for education in ministry (like, for example, the L.Th. or LAOS), but most work under local supervisors with local resources. While the Church may accept that the nature and amount of work done in the home-setting programme may be different from that College students undertake, it still has the expectation that "the standard should be identical".[138]

By 1981 Keith Rowe, the new Principal of the Theological College, was reporting to Conference that the home-setting programme had already become "an established part of our overall programme for ministerial education."[139] Around this time the College Council was to identify the programme as being an important "future direction" for Methodist training. Feeling the pressure of a "fairly static income",[140] the Council was "engaged in a search for

---

137 Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, p.77.

138 Ibid. pp.101-2.

139 MAC, 1981, p.138.

140 Ibid. 1980, p.130.

styles of ministerial education which are less costly and hopefully more effective." Realising that it might no longer be possible to offer every accepted candidate three years in the Theological College, the Council was looking to "the development of more effective styles of home-setting education."[141] One immediate result of its concern was, thus, the appointment of another College staff member, who would focus on the development and oversight of the home-setting programme. In 1982, then, Dave Mullan began an initial five-year appointment as the Church's new Field Worker in Ministry. Since this time the home-setting programme has become an increasingly important part of Methodist education for ministry. The number of students enrolled in the programme has continued to grow - from 9 of a total of 30 students in 1980 to 13 of a total of 25 students by 1987.[142] Training in the home setting while engaged in ministry has, thus, become the direction for the future of Methodist ministerial education.

---

141 Ibid. 1981, p.133.

142 Ibid. 1980, pp.602-3.
Ibid. 1987, pp.603-4.

CONCLUSION

By 1980 the Methodist presbyterate was a very different kind of ministry from that of a century before. Some of these changes were chosen and others were not. Some had gradually evolved with the developing life and thought of the Church, others were the result of changing social realities which the Church was unable to escape. Together they had created a quite radically different ministry for the 1980s and beyond.

The ordained ministry was moved in many new directions between 1880 and 1980. The acceptance of an ordained diaconate as a full and equal order of ministry symbolized the Church's rejection of a ministerial hierarchy with the clergy at the top and in control. The development of new forms of ordained ministry allowed clergy to work in all sorts of new situations and new ways, sometimes even outside the Church. The opening of the ministry to women has finally given them the chance to share in the sacramental role, bringing to it their own distinctive gifts and ways of working. The development of the minita-a-iwi has issued a challenge to the European model of ministry and returned Maori ministry back to its real home. The creation of the non-stipendiary ministry with its own programme of training, also firmly rooted in the local setting, has made it possible for a greater variety of people than ever before

to enter the presbyterate and has introduced a whole new vision of ministry and training for the future.

Any one of these changes has the potential to take both the ordained ministry and the Church in further radical directions. The presbyterate has, in a sense, been set free to develop as it will. These changes, however, will inevitably create new problems for the Church as the ministry - and, in particular, the old-style theologically-trained, ordained and stipendiary ministry - seeks to come to terms with them. The increasing concern of this ministry for its professionalism may be seen as a sign of such tension. The questions of relationships within ministry remain important issues for the Methodist Church to work through as its ordained ministry continues to develop into the late-twentieth century and beyond.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Unpublished

Interview with Lois Clarke, Christchurch, 18 August 1988.

Interview with Fred Baker, Christchurch, 8 September 1988.

Interview with Bill Laws, Christchurch, 14 September 1988.

Letter from Dave Mullan, 1 August 1988.

Conversation with Dave Mullan, Auckland, December 1989.

Published

Handbook of the Regulations of the Australasian Wesleyan Methodist Church, 1885.

Journal of the Methodist Annual Conference, 1880-1980.

Laws and Regulations of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, 1928-1980.

Methodist Annual Conference, 1880-1987.

Minutes of the Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, (Great Britain), 1946.

New Zealand Methodist Times,

Plan for Union, Joint Commission for Church Union, 1971.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Unpublished

Ross M. Anderson, "New Zealand Methodism and World War 1 Crisis In A Liberal Church", University of Canterbury, 1983 (MA Thesis).

Andrew Donaldson, "The Ordination of Women in the Methodist Church of New Zealand", 1985-6.

Helen Foy, "Methodism in Hawera 1874-1918, The History of a Church and Community in a Pioneering Settlement", University of Otago, 1980 (BA Hons.).

Published

Aylesbeare Arthur & Nora Buttle, A Tale of Two Colleges, Wesley College and Seminary and Prince Albert College,

(Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.8, No.2, March 1950).

Stanley Ayling, John Wesley, London, Williams Collins Sons & Company Ltd., 1979.

Kathleen Bliss, The Service and Status of Women in the Churches, London, S.C.M. Press Ltd., 1952.

Wesley A. Chambers, Not Self - But Others, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, No.48, August 1987).

Leslie F. Church, More About the Early Methodist People, London, The Epworth Press, 1949.

Allan K. Davidson, Christianity in Aotearoa, A History of Church and Society in New Zealand, 1989.

Graeme Dunstall, "The Social Pattern", in W.H. Oliver & B.R. Williams (eds.), The Oxford History of New Zealand, Wellington, Oxford University Press, 1981.

Robert E. Fordyce, "Dunholme" Methodist Theological College, Auckland, New Zealand, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.9, No.2,).

Ruth Fry, Out of the Silence, Methodist Women of Aotearoa 1822-1985, Christchurch, Methodist Publishing, 1987.

A.D. Gilbert, Religion and Society in Industrial England, Church, Chapel and Social Change, London, Longman, 1976.

Alan Haig, The Victorian Clergy, London & Sydney, Croom Helm, 1984.

E.W. Hames, Coming of Age, The United Church 1913-1972, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.28, Nos.1 & 2, 1974).

Out of the Common Way, The European Church in the Colonial Era 1840-1913, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.27, Nos.3 & 4, 1972).

Wesley College, A Centenary Survey, 1844-1944, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.3, No.4 & Vol.4, No.1).

George I. Laurenson, Te Hahi Weteriana, Three Half Centuries of the Methodist Maori Missions 1822-1972, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.27, Nos.1 & 2, 1972).

J.J. Lewis, The Trinity College Story, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.31, Nos.3 & 4, October 1978).

J.J. Lewis, A.K. Petch, R.D. Rakena, The Search for Unity, Methodism and Ecumenism in New Zealand, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, No.41, June 1983).

Peter J. Lineham, New Zealanders and the Methodist Evangel, An Interpretation of the Policies and Performance of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, No.42, September 1983).

David S. Mullan, Diakonia and the Moa, An Account of Deacons and Presbyters in the Self-supporting Ministry of the Methodist Church of New Zealand, Auckland, Methodist Theological College, 1984.

"Ministerial Selection, An Investigation into the Selection of Ministers for the Methodist Church", Massey, 1972.

Erik Olssen, "Towards a New Society", in Oliver & Williams.

Ruawai D. Rakena, The Maori Response to the Gospel, (Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society of New Zealand, Vol.25, Nos. 1-4, August 1971).

Margaret Reid Martin, "A Personal Reflection and Vision", in Enid Bennett (ed.), With Heads Uncovered, Auckland, The Women in Ministry Network, 1988.

J.D. Salmond, By Love Serve, Christchurch, Presbyterian Bookroom, 1963.

John T. Wilkinson, "The Rise of Other Methodist Traditions", in Rupert Davies, A. Raymond George & Gordon Rupp (eds.), A History of the Methodist Church in Great Britain, Vol.2, London, Epworth Press, 1978.

APPENDICES

TABLE 1

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
TOTAL HOME MISSIONARIES, DEACONESSES/MISSIONARY SISTERS, MINITA-A-IWI, DEACONS AND OTHERS

Year	Home Missionaries	Minita-a-Iwi	Deaconesses/ Miss.Sisters	Deacons	Others
1880	11				
1890	* 13(16)				
1900	22				
1910	43				
1920	41E 2M		23		
1930	57E 12M		36		2
1940	50E 38M		41		2
1950	41E 40M		57		1
1960	27E 36M		64		
1970	10E 31M		29		24
1980	38			20	1
1987	1	32		26	4

SOURCE: MAC 1880-1987. Stations of Home Missionaries & An Alphabetical List of the Ministers and Probationers in connexion with the Methodist Church of New Zealand [hereafter Alphabetical List]

* The 1890 Conference Minutes give two different totals for this year (see pages 5 and 15)

TABLE 2

MINISTERS RESTING AND
MINISTRY BEYOND THE PARISH

Year	Servg other orgs (NZ)	Foreign Missions	Others O'seas	Study	Ill hlth	Without Pastoral Charge	Resting N.O.D.	Total
1880							1	1
1881		1	1					2
1882								
1883								
1884								
1885			1					1
1886		1						1
1887			1					1
1888			1					1
1889			2					2
1890		1	1					2
1891		1	1				1	3
1892			1					1
1893	1		1					2
1894	1	1						2
1895			3					3
1896			5		2			7
1897			4				1	5
1898			1		1	1		3
1899							3	3
1900			2			2		4
1901		1	3			2		6
1902		1	3	1				5
1903			2	1		2		5
1904		1	3	1	1	2		8
1905			3		1	2		6
1906			1			2		3
1907			1		1	2		4
1908	1		2		2	1		6
1909						1	1	2
1910		1				1		2
1911		1	6					7
1912			2					2
1913		2	2				2	6
1914		1	2			2	1	6
1915		1				3		4
1916			2			2		4
1917	1	2				1		4
1918	4	1	2					7
1919	4		2			3	2	11
1920						3		3
1921		1				1	2	4
1922		1	1			4		6
1923			3				1	4
1924		2	3				3	8
1925		1	3				1	5
1926		2	1				2	5
1927						1	3	4

TABLE 2 (continued)

Year	Servg other orgs. (NZ)	Foreign Missions	Others O'seas	Study	Ill health	Without Pastoral Charge	Resting N.O.D.	Total
1928		1	2			1	1	5
1929			2			1		3
1930			2			1		3
1931		4	1			1	1	7
1932		4				1	1	6
1933		3				1	1	5
1934		1				1		2
1935	1	1				2		4
1936	1	1				2		4
1937	1		1			2		4
1938	1		2			2	3	8
1939	1	1	3			1	1	7
1940	1		3			1		5

TABLE 2 (continued)

Year	Chap-lains	Servg other orgs (NZ)	Servg other chchs (NZ)	For. Mssns	Others O'seas	Study	Ill health	Trde bus. or prof.	With-out Past. Chge	Rstg. N.O.D.	Total
1941		1			1		1		2		5
1942		1			1				4		6
1943		1			1				2	1	5
1944		1							2	2	5
1945		1			2				3	1	7
1946		1		1	1				7	1	11
1947		1		1	1				6		9
1948		1		1	1				7	1	11
1949	1			1					3	3	8
1950	1	1			2				2	1	7
1951		1							3	4	8
1952		1		1	2				3	2	9
1953		1		1	1				2	3	8
1954		1							2	2	5
1955	1			1							2
1956	1				1				3		5
1957	1	1		2	5				5		14
1958	1	1		1	2				2		7
1959	2	2			2				1		7
1960	2	1			1	1			1	1	7
1961	3	1		1	1				3	1	10
1962	3	1		1	4				3	1	13
1963	3	1		1	2				2	3	12
1964	4	1		2	3				1	3	14
1965	5	1		2	3	1			1	3	16
1966	5	1		1	2	1			3	3	16
1967	4	1			5				2	2	14
1968	4	1		3	4				2	8	22
1969	4	3			6	1			2	6	22
1970	6	3	1	1	5	2		2	1	4	25
1971	6	3	1	2	9	2		2	2	3	30
1972	7	2	1	1	9	4	3	10			37
1973	8	1	1		10	4	2	17			43

TABLE 2 (continued)

Year	Church or church rel. position (NZ)	Serving other churches (NZ)	O'seas Missns	Other O'seas	Not church or church related position	Total
1974	16	1	6	16	39	
1975	20	2	4	19	45	
1976	14	2	2	26	44	

Year	Chap-lains	Servg other orgs (NZ)	Servg other chchs (NZ)	O'seas missns	Other O'seas	Study	No appnt avlble	Not church or ch. related posn.	Total
1977	5	5	2	1	6	1		26	46
1978	6	4	2		6			29	47
1979	7	5	2		4			29	47
1980	8	5	2		2			30	47
1981	7	6	2		6			24	45
1982	7	6	2		4		1	23	43
1983	9	6	1		5			22	43
1984	9	6	2		7			19	43
1985	8	6	1		7		1	12	35
1986	8	6	1		5			12	32
1987	7	6	1		6	1	1	14	36

SOURCE: MAC, 1880-1987 (Questions of Conference and the stationing list)

NOTE: "Others overseas" includes those already there, those visiting and those transferred.

TABLE 3

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
TOTAL MINISTERS AND PROBATIONERS IN CONNEXION WITH THE CHURCH, INCLUDING SUPERNUMARIES

Year	Ministers and probationers (including supernumaries) Europn	Maori	Total	Supernumeraries Perm'nt	Temp	Total
1880	72	8	80	8	2	10
1881	76	10	86	8	2	10
1882	77	10	87	9		9
1883	79	10	89	9	1	10
1884	74	10	84	6		6
1885	76	9	85	6	1	7
1886	78	9	87	6	2	8
1887	78	9	87	6		6
1888	80	6	86	6	2	8
1889	76	6	82	5	1	6
1890	79	6	85	5		5
1891	80	6	86	6	2	8
1892	80	5	85	9(1M)	1	10
1893	85	5	90	10(1M)	1	11
1894	87	5	92	10(1M)		10
1895	91	6	97	9(1M)	2	11
1896	113	6	119	12	1	13
1897	115	6	121	11	3	14
1898	113	6	119	12	2	14
1899						
1900	117	7	124	11		11
1901	118	7	125	10		10
1902	122	7	129	12		12
1903	126	8	134	13	1	14
1904	130	8	138	13	2	15
1905	134	9	143	14	1	15
1906	136	9	145	16		16
1907	135	9	144	13	1	14
1908	139	8	147	13	1	14
1909	138	8	146	15		15
1910	137	9	146	14	2	16
1911	146	10	156	13	4	17
1912	152	10	162	17	3	20
1913	191	10	201	23	3	26
1914	190	10	200	25(1M)	6	31
1915	191	12	203	29(1M)	3	32
1916	191	12	203	30(1M)	5	35
1917	193	12	205	29(1M)	2	31
1918	187	12	199	31(1M)	1	32
1919	191	11	202	30	1	31
1920	189	11	200	37	2	39
1921	186	12	198	38	2	40
1922	194	13	207	35	5	40
1923	192	13	205	37	4	41
1924	187	12	199	39	3	42
1925	199	12	211	40	2	42

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Year	Ministers and probationers (including supernumeraries) Europn	Maori	Total	Supernumeraries Permn't	Temp.	Total
1926	195	9	204	39		39
1927	196	9	205	36		36
1928	197	11	208	35	2	37
1929	197	11	208	32	1	33
1930	201	11	212	31	3	34
1931	203	9	212	36	2	38
1932	207	9	216	34		34
1933	209	9	218	37	1	38
1934	206	8	214	37	2	39
1935	210	7	217	40	1	41
1936	210	7	217	39	1	40
1937	210	5	215	36	2	38
1938	216	5	221	34	3	37
1939	219	4	223	38	2	40
1940	222	4	226	45		45
1941	225	5	230	45	1	46
1942	227	4	231	48	2	50
1943	229	5	234	50	2	52
1944	226	5	231	46	1	47
1945	223	5	228	48		48
1946	221	5	226	49	1	50
1947	223	5	228	54		54
1948	222	5	227	58		58
1949	232	5	237	60		60
1950	235	4	239	60		60
1951	245	4	249	58		58
1952	250	4	254	58		58
1953	255	3	258	62(2M)		62
1954	256	3	259	63(2M)		63
1955	261	3	264	69(2M)		69
1956	268	1	269	66(1M)		66
1957	270	1	271	65(1M)		65
1958	279	1	280	63(1M)		63
1959	289	1	290	65(1M)		65
1960	292	1	293	63(1M)	1	64
1961	300	1	301	60(1M)		60
1962	309	1	310	61(1M)		61
1963	312	1	313	57(1M)		57
1964	313	1	314	56(1M)		56
1965	314	1	315	57(1M)		57

TABLE 3 (Cont'd)

Year	Total ministers and probationers in connexion (including supernumeraries)	Total supernumaries
1966	315	58
1967	321	64
1968	324	69
1969	316	64
1970	315	71
1971	306	71
1972	303	69
1973	302	74
1974	298	72
1975	296	72
1976	298	82
1977	302	84
1978	304	90
1979	319	89
1980	320	96
1981	318	95
1982	324	102
1983	323	99
1984	322	103
1985	318	109
1986	319	111
1987	323	114

SOURCE: MAC, 1880-1987 (Alphabetical list)

NOTE: I am not sure how accurate the alphabetical list is. Checking probationers most of them are included in the list most of the time, but there are a few who are not. I think this is more for those on probation and training at the same time. Some are in and some are not. There may be a criteria for inclusion or the list may just be inconsistent. Because of this I have not been able to separate probationers out. The best I can do is a joint figure for students and probationers.

TABLE 4

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
GROWTH IN NUMBERS OF MINISTERS AND PROBATIONERS

Year	Total ministers and probationers	Years	Growth %	Years	Growth %
1880	80				
1885	85	1880-85	6.25	1880-90	6.25
1890	85	1885-90	0.0		
1895	97	1890-95	14.12	1890-1900	45.88
1900	124	1895-1900	27.84		
1905	143	1900-05	15.32	1900-10	17.74
1910	146	1905-10	2.10		
1915	203	1910-15	39.04	1910-20	36.99
1920	200	1915-20	-1.48		
1925	211	1920-25	5.5	1920-30	6.0
1930	212	1925-30	0.47		
1935	217	1930-35	2.36	1930-40	6.60
1940	226	1935-40	4.15		
1945	228	1940-45	0.89	1940-50	5.75
1950	239	1945-50	4.83		
1955	264	1950-55	10.46	1950-60	22.59
1960	293	1955-60	10.99		
1965	315	1960-65	7.51	1960-70	7.51
1970	315	1965-70	0.0		
1975	296	1970-75	-6.03	1970-80	1.59
1980	320	1975-80	8.11		
1985	318	1980-85	-0.63		

SOURCE: MAC, 1880-1985 (Alphabetical List)

TABLE 5

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
MINISTERS AND PROBATIONERS RESIGNED FROM MINISTRY

Year	No.	Year	No.	Year	No.
1880		1916	1	1952	1
1881		1917	1	1953	
1882		1918	1	1954	
1883	2	1919	1	1955	
1884		1920	1	1956	1
1995		1921	1	1957	
1886		1922		1958	
1887		1923	2	1959	
1888	1	1924	4	1960	1
1889	1	1925		1961	2
1890		1926	4	1962	
1891		1927		1963	
1892		1928	4	1964	1
1893		1929		1965	2
1894		1930		1966	
1895	1	1931	3	1967	1
1896	1	1932		1968	
1897		1933	1	1969	2
1898		1934		1970	3
1899	1	1935		1971	6
1900	1	1936	1	1972	2
1901	1	1937	1	1973	2
1902		1938		1974	3
1903		1939	2	1975	2
1904		1940		1976	
1905	1	1941		1977	3
1906	1	1942	2	1978	3
1907	1	1943	1	1979	
1908	1	1944	2	1980	1
1909	1	1945	1	1981	3
1910	1	1946	1	1982	4
1911	3	1947	1	1983	2
1912		1948		1984	3
1913	1	1949	2	1985	5
1914	2	1950	1	1986	3
1915	2	1951	2	1987	3

10 yearly:		
	1880–89	4
	1890–99	3
	1900–09	7
	1910–19	13
	1920–29	16
	1930–39	8
	1940–49	10
	1950–59	6
	1960–69	9
	1970–79	24
	1980–87	24

SOURCE; MAC, 1880–1987 (Questions of Conference)

TABLE 6

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
QUALIFICATIONS OF MINISTERS AND PROBATIONERS

Year	Bach.	Bach. and/or Dip. or B.D.	Mast.	Mast. & Dip. or B.D.	Dr	Dipl.	L.Th. S.Th.	Other Prof'l	Total	Total Min. & Prob.	%
1880										80	
1890										85	
1900	1		1		1				3	124	2.42
1910	4		2						6	146	4.11
1920	5		5		1				11	200	5.50
1930	4	1	6	1	3				15	212	7.08
1940	11	3	10	3	2		1 L		30	226	13.27
1950	25	4	9	6	6		1 L		51	239	21.34
1960	31	5	20	9	6		1 L		72	293	24.57
1970	37	13	20	9	7		2 L	1 ACA 1 FCA	90	315	28.57
1980	45	19	17	17	9	5	7 L	1 FCA	120	320	37.50
1987	47	18	16	16	10	7	15 L 2 S	1 ACA 1 FCA 4 *	137	323	42.42

.....SOURCE: Figures taken from chronological list 1880-1970, and alphabetical list 1980-1987. Highest qualification only is taken.

.....*MST(T): Radiography; NZAP: Psychotherapy and Counselling; MPS: Pharmaceutical Society; M.A.N.D.

TABLE 7

WESLEYAN AND UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF NEW ZEALAND 1880-1987
STUDENTS AND PROBATIONERS IN TRAINING

Year	Recd for trng		Recd but def.		Cont. trng		Recd for prob.		Cont. prob.		Total	
	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M
1880	3				2		5	1	13	3	23	4
1881	2				3		5	2	14	4	24	6
1882	1				1		4	2	15	4	21	6
1883	4						3		13	6	20	6
1884	1				4				11	6	16	6
1885	3				3		2		7	2	15	2
1886	1				4		1		8	1	14	1
1887	2				4		2		5	1	13	1
1888					3		3		5	1	11	1
1889	2				2		1		6		11	
1890	1				3				7		11	
1891	1				2		2		4		9	
1892	1				2		1		5		9	
1893	3				2		4		4		13	
1894	3				2		3		7		15	
1895	4	1			2		4		8	1	18	2
1896	4				2		5	1	14	1	25	2
1897	2				4		1		15	2	22	2
1898	3	1			5				10	1	18	2
1899	1				2	1	4		8	1	15	2
1900	5		1				5	2	7		18	2
1901	3		2		2		4		11	2	22	2
1902		1	2		5		6		12	2	25	3
1903	2	1	1		6		4	1	14	2	27	4
1904					6		6	1	11	1	23	2
1905	3		2		4		4		14	2	27	2
1906	2	1	4		6		5		12	2	29	3
1907		1	3		7		6		14	1	30	2
1908		1	4		6		6		14		30	1
1909	2		4	1	9		3		18		36	1

TABLE 7 (continued)

Year	Recd for trng Total		Recd but def.		Cont. trng.		Recd for trng and prob.		Recd for trng on prob.		Cont. trng and prob.		Recd for prob. on prob.		Recd for prob.		Cont. prob.			
	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E	M
1910			2		11										4	1	16		33	1
1911	2		1		7						1				9	2	14	1	34	3
1912	2		6		5						3				7	1	15	2	38	3
1913	1		2		13								2		3		25	3	46	3
1914	2	2	2		12										4		20	3	40	5
1915	4		2		9										9	2	15		39	2
1916	3				7				1				1		5		17	2	34	2
1917					6										5		23	2	34	2
1918															4		24	1	28	1
1919	2	1													5		20	1	27	2
1920	3				2										2	1	14		21	1
1921	5				4										1	1	8	1	18	2
1922	1				5										5	1	9	2	20	3
1923	5				5										4		9	3	23	3
1924	7				5										11		11	2	34	2
1925	6				10										3		19	2	38	2
1926	9				12										3		18		42	
1927	7				15										7		18		47	
1928	5		2		15										6		14		42	
1929	10				12										7		16		45	
1930	4				15										7		19		45	
1931	6				11										7		17		41	
1932	7				9										8		19		43	
1933	5		1		12										6		23		47	
1934	5		2		12										5		21		45	
1935	7		1		10										7		18		43	
1936	5				13										4		18		40	
1937	6		1		12										5		16		40	
1938	6	1			10										9		16		42	1
1939	6				11	1									7		18		43	1
1940	5				11										6		20		42	
1941	6				10										6		21		43	
1942	1				10										6	1	20		37	1
1943	6		1		5										6		19	1	37	1
1944	1				7										4		22	1	34	1
1945	4				5										3		22	1	34	1

TABLE 7 (cont'd)

Year	Recd for trng	Recd but def.	Cont. trng	Recd for trng and prob.	Recd for trng on prob.	Cont. trng and prob.	Recd for prob. on prob.	Recd for prob.	Cont. prob.	Total
*1946	7		4		1	3		5	16	31
1947	7		9	1	1	3		4	15	40
1948	7		14	4	1	2		3	14	45
1949	6		15		3	4		6	13	47
1950	10		14	2	1	6		9	13	55
1951	9	1	16		3	4		15	17	65
1952	7	1	16	2	4	3		8	25	66
1953	7		14	4	2	5		8	25	65
1954	5		14		3	4	3	9	20	58
1955	11		13			4	3	7	17	55
1956	11		15	1		3	2	8	14	54
1957	5		20	1	1		3	4	14	48
1958	17		14	2		1		11	16	61
1959	4		20				1	10	17	52
1960	12		17					7	19	55
1961	10		15					13	18	56
1962	12		20	9				4	20	65
1963	7		20		2			12	21	62
1964	13		18			2		8	15	56
1965	8		19	1		2		12	18	60
1966	4		23		1		2	4	23	57
1967	5		13			1		14	17	50
1968	2		8			1	1	8	20	40
1969	5		6		1	1	1	3	21	38
1970	4		6			1		4	11	26
1971	4		8					2	6	20
1972	5	1	8					4	3	21
1973	2	1	10					3	5	21
1974	3	1	8					5	6	23
1975	6	1	5					4	4	20
1976	12	2	10						1	25
1977	3		15	2				4		24
1978	6		12	1				6	2	27
1979	17		13					10	3	43
1980	8	1	21			1		5	1	37
1981	5	1	19			1		8	1	35
1982	9		13					8	2	32
1983	2		13					5	8	28
1984	6		7	3				5	12	33
1985	5		17	4		6		3	11	46
1986	9		16	5		2		6	3	41
1987	4		12	4		8		5	5	38

SOURCE: MAC, 1880–1987 (Questions of Conference)

NOTES: Those whose entrance is deferred go on to the President's List of Reserve (where they are often employed as a home missionary) and/or wait until a vacancy arises. Students and probationers with the Expeditionary Force: 1916 4S, 2P; 1917 4S, 13P; 1918 12P (these figures are included in the table). 1942 1S 3P overseas; 1943 2P overseas; 1944 1P with forces and 2 overseas; 1945 3P overseas (these figures are also included). Rangi Rogers, the last Maori to be under "Native Minister" 1938–9, 1942–5. The category changed to "Solomon Island" in 1960.

* From this year onwards European and Maori figures are combined.

Abbreviations:

Recd for trng	Received for training
Recd but def.	Received but deferred
Cont. trng.	Continuing training
Recd for trng and prob.	Received for training and probation
Recd for trng on prob.	Received for training on probation
Cont. trng and prob.	Continuing training and probation
Recd for prob. on prob.	Received for probation on probation
Recd for prob.	Received for probation
Cont. prob.	Continuing probation